

Did Paul accept the Apostolic Decree

by ISAAC SIMMONDS

FILE	DID_PAUL_ACCEPT_THE_APOSTOLIC_DECREE_326715_1310820431.D OCX (151.05K)		
TIME SUBMITTED	28-SEP-2017 02:39PM (UTC+0100)	WORD COUNT	22212
SUBMISSION ID	75558728	CHARACTER COUNT	114482

Did Paul accept the Apostolic Decree?

Isaac Simmonds

Dissertation submitted for the Degree of Master of Arts in the University of Chester in part fulfilment of the Modular Programme in *Theology*

September 2017

Abstract

The relationship between the so-called Apostolic Decree (Acts 15:20, 29) and the apostle Paul has puzzled many scholars. Following F.C Baur, many have maintained that there is at the heart of early Christianity a divide between Jewish (Petrine) and Gentile (Pauline) Christianity. On this view, Paul could never really have consented to – or even been present at – the apostolic council and agreed to this decree which established a minimum set of requirements for Gentile believers. This dissertation shall provide an in-depth exegesis of the Apostolic Council in Acts 15, placing in within the context of Second-Temple Judaism and the Book of Acts. Along these lines I shall suggest that there are three core issues when it comes relationship between the account of Apostolic Decree (Acts 15:20, 29) and the Apostle Paul. Ultimately, I shall argue that the divide between Jewish (Petrine) and Gentile (Pauline) Christianity has been overstated and derives from a misunderstanding of the Apostle Paul.

**The work is original and has not been submitted previously in support
of any qualification or course**

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Isaac Simmonds'.

Isaac Simmonds

28/09/2017

Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	5
Chapter 2: Understanding the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15	9
2.1 Second Temple Judaism and Gentile Conversion	10
2.1.1 Proselytes and Gentile Sympathizers	10
2.1.2 Exclusion of Gentiles: The Moral Impurity of the Gentile Nations	11
2.1.3 Inclusion of Gentiles: The Eschatological Pilgrimage of the Gentile Nations to Zion	15
2.2 Acts of the Apostles and the inclusion of Gentile converts	18
2.2.1 Cornelius Incident (Acts 10): Gentiles purified by the Holy Spirit	18
2.2.2 The Apostolic Decree (Acts 15): Gentiles accepted as Gentiles, but with a minimum set of requirements	21
2.2.3 Summary and Conclusion	30
Chapter 3: Paul and the Apostolic Decree	32
3.1 The First Issue: Paul's Account of the Apostolic Council in Galatians (2:1-10)	32
3.1.1 Addressed to North or South Galatia?	32
3.1.2 Early Composition of Galatians	35
3.1.3 Summary and Conclusion	40
3.2 The Second Issue: Jewish/ Gentile divide at the heart of the Apostolic Decree	41
3.2.1 Corporate participation 'in Christ Jesus'	43
3.2.2 Paul and obedience to the Mosaic Law	49
3.2.3 Summary and Conclusion	54
3.3 The Third Issue: Paul's attitude towards Apostolic Decree and the prohibitions binding on Gentile believers	56
3.3.1 Paul's position on Idol-Food in 1 Corinthians 8-10	56
3.3.2 Prohibition against "blood" and "things strangled"	63
3.3.3 Summary and Conclusion	65

Chapter 4: Conclusion	67
Bibliography	70

Chapter 1: Introduction

When it comes to the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15 many scholars indirectly or directly engage with the nineteenth century theologian F.C. Baur (1876). He proposed that early Christianity was marked by a schism and divide between Jewish (Petrine) Christianity and Gentile (Pauline) Christianity (Gasque, 2000, p. 27). This is the point at issue in the apostolic debate in Jerusalem and the row at Antioch (Galatians 1-2) as well as the party squabbles in Corinthians (cf. 1 Cor 1:12) (Wright N. , 2015, p. 13). Struck with the absence of any mention (in Acts) of this conflict between Peter and Paul, F.C. Baur (1876) contested its historical reliability and related it to the authors desire to 'represent the difference between Peter and Paul as inessential and trifling' (p. 6). Drawing on Schneckenburger, he argued that it was an attempt by a representative of the Pauline camp to create a synthesis between Pauline and Petrine parties. In other words, Luke's method is to recommend concessions on both sides, to present Paul as more "Petrine" and Peter as more "Pauline" (Tyson, 1999, p. 18). For this reason, Paul agrees to the Jerusalem Decree (Acts 15:19-21) and is willing to bring it to Antioch (Acts 15:22).

Many scholars have upheld the main thrust of this thesis of an early schism between Jewish (Petrine) Christianity and Gentile (Pauline) Christianity. This includes Dibelius (1956, pp. 96-107); Catchpole (1977, pp. 434-37); Hengel (1979: 11-17); Schneider (1980: 113; 1982: 1991); and Dunn (1983: 38). On this view, Paul could never really have consented to – or even been present at – the apostolic council and agreed to this decree which established a minimum set of requirements for Gentile believers. Hengel (1980) comments:

The "Apostolic Decree" which Luke attributed to James – probably not by chance – goes back to a compromise achieved sometime late without Paul... Paul, by contrast, never acknowledged it or practises it. His letters do not contain any clear reference to the 'Decree' (p. 117).

Alan Segal (1990) concludes that Paul was willing to accommodate for Christian unity but that the decree was inadequate and set aside the "radical ideological position of Paul", regardless of Acts' position that Paul was a participant (p. 236). Catchpole (1977) concludes that the decree must be traced to a situation not involving Paul:

If he was still alive when the decree was formulated, he was absent from the decision-making body (or, at the very least, overruled by it), and if he was not still alive when the decree was formulated his theology was not influential upon that body (1977).

Bruce (1988, pp. 282, 285; 1986, pp. 117-118) conceded that Paul was at the Jerusalem council but that he disagreed with the decree and "ignored" it. Dunn (1983, p. 38), on the other hand, found that the Jerusalem council only settled the circumcision issue and that the apostolic decree reflects a later agreement, agreed sometime later without Paul.

The starting point for this discussion will be an examination an in-depth exegesis of the Apostolic Council in Acts 15, placing it within the context of Second-Temple Judaism and the Book of Acts. On this basis, we shall explore three issues which have arisen from this account of the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15 and the Apostle Paul. The first is the relation between the Jerusalem council described in Acts 15 and Paul's accounts in Galatians 2:1-14. The majority of scholar have identified Acts 15

with Galatians 2:1-10. The most significant difference, however, is Paul's omission of the decree of Acts 15:20, 28-29, although it was the primary outcome of the meeting. A further issue is that the events of the Antioch Incident in Galatians 2:11-14 are difficult to envisage as occurring after the promulgation of the decree. For many scholars, the Decree is the solution to the Antiochene conflict reported by Paul in Gal 2: 11-14, and should have been agreed upon after and not before the clash. This has led to a marked scepticism regarding the account of the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15. As Bornkamm (1971) writes: "Paul's account makes it quite certain that the 'Apostolic Decree' can never have been part of the resolutions of the assembly (p. 42)."

The second issue is the Jewish/ Gentile divide at the heart of the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15. The common opinion since the influential publication of Han Waitz (1936) has been that the four prohibitions derive from Leviticus 17-18 which apply not only to Israel but also to the גֵּר ("resident aliens") living in the midst of Israel. On this basis David Catchpole (1977) sets two theological presuppositions of the decree: (i) the requirements are "fundamentally mosaic", that is, the Gentile Christian keep the part of the law which applied to them, and correspondingly, the Jews keep the law in a "more extensive sense"; and (ii) following from this, that the theology underlying the Decree is "one which sees the Christian gospel as doing nothing about the Jew/ Gentile distinction. That is, Jews remain Jews, and Gentiles remain Gentiles (p. 430)." For David Catchpole these theological presuppositions would have been "repugnant to Paul".

The third issue is Paul's attitude towards Apostolic Decree in Acts 15:20, 28-29, and the four prohibitions binding on Gentile believers. Paul clearly repeats the prohibition against sexual immorality and viewed it as a destructive vice which undermines a believer's inheritance in God's Kingdom (1 Cor 5:11; Gal 5:9; Col 3:5; Eph 5:4, 5; cf.

Rom 1:26-27). The issue has been his relationship the other restrictions: 'things polluted by idols, whatever has been strangled and blood' (Acts 15:20, 29). Barrett (1965) contends that at the heart of Paul's position in 1 Corinthians 8-10 he permits the eating of idol-food, concluding that "it is difficult to believe that Paul was present when the Decree was drawn up" (p. 149). Fee (1987) admits that "Pauls response to this question makes his own relationship to the decree a matter of some historical difficulty. (p. 360)" A. J. M Wedderburn (1993) writes:

It is most remarkable that Paul make no mention of this agreement [the apostolic decree] in 1 Cor 8-10: there he tackles the whole question of eating meat offered to idols without the slightest hint that he has been party to an agreement which expressly forbade the consumption of such meat. In fact he would have been condoning the breaking, or at least ignoring, of this requirement of the decree under certain circumstances (1 Cor 10: 25-26) (p. 373).

For Richard Bauckham (1995) it may be possible to read Paul's discussion on idol-food in 1 Corinthians 8-10 as Paul's interpretation of the prohibition. The real problem is that "Paul seems to ignore the prohibition on eating meat with blood in it" in 1 Cor 10: 25, 27. The prohibition would qualify this advice to such an extent "that it is difficult to suppose he simply takes it for granted. (p. 470)"

Chapter 2: Understanding the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15

The issue at the Council of Jerusalem is whether 'gentile converts must be circumcised and thereby keep the law of Moses (15: 1, 5). The solution to the inclusion of an increasing number of Gentiles in the church, for many of Jewish birth, is simple: they should be admitted in the usual way proselytes are adopted, by circumcision (if they were male) and the undertaking to obey the Mosaic Law.

For Peter, however, the conversion of Cornelius and his household was the catalyst for his view that gentile converts need not be circumcised (Acts 11; cf. Acts 15). From this followed the first large-scale movement of gentile conversion in Antioch (Acts 11: 20-26) and the missionary journeys of Barnabas and Paul to the cities of south Galatia where they established mixed communities of Jewish and Gentile believers (Acts 13-14). Finally, in Acts 15 there is a meeting involving all Christian leaders which resulted in the promulgation of an authoritative ruling for all the churches, stating that Gentile believers need not be circumcised and obey the Mosaic Law. Therefore, both Acts 11 and 15 wrestled with the same issue of uncircumcised gentile converts in the church: the former stressing the issue of table fellowship; whilst the latter the validity of gentile conversion apart from circumcision and obedience to the Mosaic Law. Nonetheless, these issues of table fellowship and conversion are inseparable within Second-Temple Judaism.

The starting point for this discussion will be an examination of what it meant, in the Second Temple Judaism, for Gentiles to convert to Judaism and the corresponding issues of social intercourse. This will enable us to make sense of the resounding affirmation in Acts 11 and 15 that gentiles are full members of the covenant community without becoming Proselyte's. Finally, we shall explore the scriptural

argument of James that the prophets predicted gentiles would join the eschatological people of God as gentiles (15:15-19), *but* that they must keep a minimum set of requirements as proscribed by Torah: 'to abstain only from things polluted by idols and from fornication and from whatever has been strangled and from blood' (15:20, 29).

2.1 Second Temple Judaism and Gentile Conversion

2.1.1 Proselytes and Gentile Sympathizers

The concept of Proselytism in Second Temple Judaism is rooted in the pre-exilic category of גר ("resident aliens"). It originated from the foreigners who left Egypt along with the Hebrews or the Canaanites who remained after the conquests of the promised land. The tendency in the Torah was in the direction of the incorporation of these resident aliens into the covenant community. They were not only afforded the full rights of Israelites under the law, but were held to its standards (Lev 17:15; 18:26; 19:33; 20:1; 24:16; 25:47). During the exile the original definition changed, but the term Proselyte is still used to identify those foreigners who joined themselves to the people of Israel and worshipped YHWH (Donaldson T. L., 1997, pp. 55-56). Based on Second Temple Jewish literature, Terrence Donaldson (1997, p. 57) identified three characteristics of a Proselyte: [i] exclusive devotion to the God of Israel, i.e. the abandonment of Idolatry and acknowledgement of the one true God, revealed in Torah and worshipped in the temple; [ii] the incorporation into the people of Israel and (correspondingly) the acceptance of the Torah; and [iii] for male converts, undergoing circumcision was an entry ritual.

Despite widespread agreement within Second Temple Judaism on what was needed for a full proselyte status, there is a broad diversity with respect to the status of those who did not become full proselytes. These gentile sympathizers – or so-called "God

Fearers” – identified with the Jewish community and exemplified varying degrees of commitment. They embraced, as Louis Feldman (1996) writes, ‘different levels of interest in and commitment to Judaism, ranging from people who supported synagogues financially (perhaps to get political support of the Jews) to people who accepted certain distinctively Jewish practises, notably the sabbath. (p. 344)’ For some this may have been an end in itself; for others, a step towards full conversion. Nonetheless, the fundamental difference between a God-fearer and a proselyte is in such matters as Circumcision and full observance of Mosaic Law.

2.1.2 Exclusion of Gentiles: The Moral Impurity of the Gentile Nations

Jonathan Klawans (2004; 2005) and Christine Hayes (2002) have argued that the gentile nations were regarded in the Second Temple period as morally impure and profane. The foundation of moral purity is the holiness code in Leviticus 18-26, whereby certain practises or deeds (namely murder, sexual violations and idolatry) are thought to generate impurity, which defile the sinner, the land of Israel, the sanctuary. These impurities are what the Canaanites committed before Israel possessed the land (lev 18: 24-25, 27), which polluted it and resulted in them being vomited out (lev 18:15). The warning for Israel is that if they repeat the sins of the Canaanites they will suffer the same fate (), which they did resulting in the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles (cf. Jer 2:7; Ezek 36: 17-18). The use of the language of impurity with respect to these sins is widely documented throughout biblical (Jer 2:23; Lam 4:14-15; Ezek 20:30-31; 36:18,25; Ps 106:36-39) and Second Temple Jewish Literature (Jub 1:9; 16:5; 20:7; T.Mos. 8:4; 2 Bar 60:1-2; 66:2; Sib. Or. 1:77) (Klawans, 2004, pp. 26-31).

The moral impurity of Israel could be attributed to close association with gentiles living within the land. There is no contagion associated with moral impurity: gentile (or Jewish) sinners do not defile those within his or her physical reach (as with ritual impurity). But close association increases the risk of repeating the moral impurity of the Canaanites. This includes, first and foremost, intermarriage. Deuteronomy 7:1-4 and Exodus 34:14-16 prohibited marriage with men or women from seven Canaanite nations. The given reason (7:4) is that they are idolatrous and will lead astray any Israelites they marry. The consequence of this is expressed at various points in Israelite history (For example, in Number 15; Judges 3:4-6; 1 Kings 11:1-2; 1 Kings 16:31-32; Ezra 9:7-11) (Hayes, 2002, pp. 24-26).

The second, but more contentious implication, is that Jews avoided table-fellowship with Gentiles due to their morally impurity. In Greco-Roman literature, Diodorus, Tacitus and Philostratus attest that Jews avoided table-fellowship with outsiders. Tacitus specifies that they 'take their meals apart, they sleep apart, and, although they are as a race much given to lust, they abstain from intercourse with foreign women (Histories, 5.5.2)'. Nevertheless, these writers never discuss, as Crossley (2004) has recognised, the 'question of table-fellowship between Jews and Gentile on Jewish terms' (p. 145). For J.D.G Dunn (1990) the only obstacle to shared table fellowship were the laws concerning unclean food, ritual purity and tithing.

E.P.Sanders (1990), on the other hand, drew attention to the fact that ritual impurity was removed only when one entered the temple and that ritual impurity was otherwise the rule. All that impurity meant, Sanders stated, referring to the Gentiles, 'was that they could not enter further into the temple (p. 176)'. Thus, for E.P Sanders the only obstacle to unrestricted table fellowship are the laws of unclean food and concerns over food sacrificed to idols. Most of the texts which deal with these issues,

as E.P Sanders (1990) has recognised, have the 'implied paraenetic purpose of advising Jews of what to do in Gentile lands or at Gentile tables: avoid the meat and wine, and preferably bring your own food (p. 177).'

Markus Bockmuehl (2000) has shown, however, that there were divergent views and that observant Jews might have adopted one of the following positions:

1. Refuse all table fellowship with Gentiles and refuse to enter a Gentile house,
2. Invite Gentiles to their house and prepare a Jewish meal,
3. Take their own food to a Gentile's house, or indeed
4. Dine with Gentiles on the explicit or implicit understanding that food they would eat was neither prohibited in the Torah nor tainted with idolatry (p. 58).

Options (2), (3) and (4), would be compatible with shared table fellowship with Gentiles. Nonetheless, the quest for holiness, as reflected in the priestly conduct of the Pharisees and Qumran community, meant that they adopted option (1) and avoided individuals, and even whole groups, that were ascribed as morally impure. This position is reflected in book of Jubilees (22:16), which describes gentile inhabitants of the land of Israel as defiled, due to their idolatry and sexual sins, and that they should 'separate' from them and 'not eat with them'. It is further found in the synoptic gospels, where that Pharisees are consistently depicted as critical of Jesus because he ate with tax collectors and sinners (Matt 9:10; 11:19; Mark 2:16; Luke 5:30; 7:34; 15:1). Moreover, within early rabbinic tradition, there is a negative view on table fellowship in t. Abodah Zarah, 4.5 attributed to Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar. For Qumran community candidates for membership were put on probation period and

their deeds examined for a whole year before they could eat the communal food (1QS 6. 17-21; War 2.138; cf. CD 15.14-15); if members violated community rules they were excluded from the shared table (1QS .2-21; 8.22-24; War 2.143).

Moral purity is connected to behaviour and it is assumed that if Jews and Gentiles alike abstain from or repent of idolatry and other moral behaviour they will be considered morally pure. They could still be considered, however, as inherently profane. Christine Hayes (2002) has recognized that there is 'a divinely ordained hierarchy' which 'extends from the most profane members to the most holy' (p. 34). This is represented by the fact that each group is permitted to certain areas of the Temple sanctuary:

The Israelites are allowed in the courtyard of the sacrificial altar; the Levites guard entry to inner areas and tend to a variety of temple tasks; priests minister in the adytum, in which the incense altar is found; and the high priest is permitted to enter the inner most shrine – the holy of holies – once a year on the Day of purgation (p. 35).

According to Leviticus, the high priest must preserve his holiness by observing genealogical purity and marrying a virgin from within the priestly clan (Lev 21:14-15). Ezekiel tightened these requirements for ordinary priests (44:22). It is Ezra-Nehemiah, on the other hand, which advances the novel idea that all lay Israelites – and not merely the priests – are a "holy seed" (2 Ezra 9:1-2) distinct from the profane seed of the gentiles. They should not marry Gentiles, otherwise they would lose their special status from the surrounding nations (Hayes, 2002, pp. 27-28). Christine Hayes has argued that this "holy seed" ideology is taken up and developed in a few texts: Jubilees and Qumran writings (such as 4QMMT).

2.1.3 Inclusion of Gentiles: The Eschatological Pilgrimage of the Gentile Nations to Zion

Second Temple Judaism consisted of a range of different interest groups. Josephus speaks of four 'sects' or 'schools of thought' – the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes and Zealots. Nevertheless, we can speak of a common and unifying core for Second Temple Judaism, on which the more diverse forms of Judaism were built. J. D. G. Dunn (2006) discerned "four pillars of Second Temple Judaism": monotheism, election, covenant and Land. The most fundamental belief is that there is one God, the creator of the whole universe, and that this God had chosen the people of Israel to do his will. Bound up with the belief in monotheism and election is the idea of covenant: God promised to save and protect them but lay upon them the obligation of obedience to the Law of Moses. The basis for the covenant is a set of promises to the patriarchs (Genesis 12, 15, 17, 22, etc.), chief among which is 'blessing' with explicit reference to the land and its prosperity. The emphasis is on 'blessing' as the consequence of covenant fidelity. On other hand, curses would follow from covenant disobedience (see Deuteronomy Ch. 27-30) and the ultimate curse is exile from the land.

This belief in monotheism, election, covenant and land led to some kind eschatology. Eschatology is essentially about hopes and expectations for the future of Israel and the world. The chief hopes and expectations within Second-Temple Judaism were, as E.P Sanders (2016) writes, 'for the re-establishment of the twelve tribes; for the subjugation or conversion of the Gentiles; for a new, purified, or renewed and glorious temple; and for purity and righteousness in both worship and morals.' (p. 473) When the Babylonians had invaded Judea in 597 BCE, they destroyed the temple in Jerusalem and sent the people into exile from their land. There were,

however, in Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel promises that the covenant would be renewed and that Israel would be restored to its rightful place. As Nicholas G. Piotrowski (2016) writes, there is 'one plan for the ages: the deuteronomistic cycle of sin – exile – restoration' (p. 102).

It is precisely when God acted to restore Israel's fortunes, that the nations would flock to Zion to learn about the true God and worship him. There is a cause-and-effect sequence envisaged: first Israel's vindication, and then the pilgrimage of the gentiles to Zion. In Isaiah, for example, there is an eschatological vision of Jerusalem as a place of pilgrimage where all nations find salvation:

And in the last days the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of mountains... and all nations shall flow unto it. And many peoples shall go, and say: Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us his way, and we will walk in his paths. (Isaiah 2:2,3)

From the Lord's house will flow rivers which will bring healing to the nations (Ezekiel 47: 1-12; Joel 3:18; Zechariah 14:8).

Despite the geographical 'return' of the exiles in the late sixth century and the rebuilding of the temple at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, corresponding with the 70-year exile of Jeremiah 25:29, the exile is not considered over in Second Temple Jewish literature. Whilst Jeremiah's "return" was a historic reality, it did not compete the restoration expected within prophetic literature: they still lived under the rule of foreign overlords; the exiles were not streaming home from the diaspora; the spirit of holiness had not been poured out; and the nations were not flocking to Zion to worship YHWH. It is indicated in Ezra 3:10-13 and Haggai 2:3 that the newly built second temple paled in comparison with the former Solomonic sanctuary, and with

that, an implied disconnection to the prophetic literatures glorious promises of a restored temple in Ezekiel 40-48 along with Isaiah 54, 56 and 60. Thus we find that Daniel 9: 24-27 draws on the prophecy of Jeremiah 25:29 to develop an understanding of a much longer extended exile. The "return" will not occur 70 years after the exile, but seventy "weeks" of years (four hundred and ninety years). Likewise works of 1 Enoch 89-90, Testament of Levi 16-17, Jubilees, Tobit 13-14 follow Daniel in this move. In Tobit 13-14, for example, we find a clear example of this restoration eschatologically, which includes the conversion of the Gentile following the restoration of Israel:

Then [i.e., after the restoration of Jerusalem] all the Gentiles will turn to fear the Lord God in truth, and will bury their idols. All the Gentiles will praise the Lord, and his people will give thanks to God, and the Lord will exalt his people. And all who love the lord God in truth and righteousness will rejoice, showing mercy to our brethren. (14:6-7)

Likewise, in 1 Enoch 90.33, the resurrected Jewish martyrs ("destroyed") and diaspora Jews ("dispersed"), join with the Gentiles to worship God in the temple and experience the Lord's Favour. Lastly, in Psalms of Solomon 17, the gentiles will gather "from the ends of the earth" to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, bringing the returning exiles with them, to see the glory of the Lord (v.30-31); they will live under the yoke of the Messianic king who will have compassion on those Gentile nations that fear him (30,24).

Nonetheless, it is unclear in these biblical and post-biblical texts, as Terrence L. Donaldson (2007) has recognized, 'whether these gentiles who participate in the blessings of the end-times do as converts or as righteous Gentiles' (p. 682). In other words, the extent to which they are incorporated into Israel. Some passages suggest

that Gentiles continue to be Gentiles (e.g., Isa 25:6-10; Zech 8:20-23); others lean in the direction of full participation (e.g., Isa 2:2-4) (Donaldson T. L., 2007, p. 672).

2.2 Acts of the Apostles and the inclusion of Gentile converts

Therefore, within second-Temple Judaism there is, on the one hand, an exclusion of the gentiles. They were both profane and morally impure and close association with Gentiles (through intermarriage and shared table fellowship) increased the risk of them repeating the moral impurity of the Canaanites and polluting the “holy seed” of Israel. But there is, besides this negative vision of the gentile nations, a positive outlook for the inclusion of the Gentiles nations at the Eschaton, when they would flock to Zion to worship the true God and would be incorporated into the people of God. In Acts of the Apostles, the Eschaton has already arrived: Jesus the Messiah has restored a remnant of Israel; the corollary of which is that the Gentiles have been accepted into the Eschatological people of God without becoming proselytes (i.e. without circumcision and observance of the Mosaic Law). This is the lesson Peter learns in Acts 10-11: the blessing of the spirit has been given to Gentiles as well as Jews who believe in Jesus Christ; both had been purified of their moral impurity. The corollary of this is that there are no barriers to table fellowship between Jewish and Gentile believers. Finally, James’ argument is that the prophets, when they predicted the Gentiles would join the eschatological people of God, made it clear that they would do so as Gentiles *but* that they must keep a minimum set of requirements as proscribed by the Torah: ‘to abstain only from things polluted by idols and from fornication and from whatever has been strangled and from blood’ (15:20, 29).

2.2.1 Cornelius Incident (Acts 10): Gentiles purified by the Holy Spirit

In Acts 10, Peter has a vision: he sees a sheet let down from heaven with a “mixed bag” of animals of both clean and unclean animals, and hears a heavenly voice

which orders Peter to slaughter and consume the food; to which Peter objects: "by no means, Lord, for I have never eaten anything unholy and unclean" (Acts 10:11-16).

While Peter is pondering the meaning of the vision, three men appear at his house and he goes with them to the house of Cornelius. At arrival at his house Peter says to them "you yourselves know that it is unlawful for a Jew to associate with or to visit a Gentile". The implication is obvious: Jews did regard Gentiles as profane and impure; which meant that they did not share table-fellowship with Gentiles. But, at this point the meaning of Peter's vision becomes clear: "God has shown me that I should not call anyone profane and unclean" (Acts 10: 28).

Historically Peter's vision has been interpreted to mean that both unclean food and Gentiles have been pronounced clean by God, at least by the time of the Reformation this dual interpretation is established in Calvin's commentary on Acts 10:15. Later writers have continued in this vein, including modern scholars such as F.F Bruce (1988, p. 206) and Darrell Bock (Bock, 2007, pp. 390, 394). Nonetheless, despite the context of slaughtering and eating forbidden animals, Peter does not reach the conclusion that he is now free to eat whatever he wants. Instead, the meaning of the vision is about gentiles, and not about food (10:28, 34). As S.G. Wilson (2005) writes:

What if anything, we are supposed to infer about the question of clean and unclean animals is unclear... If the vision that the Levitical distinction between clean and unclean has been revoked then a radical departure from the Torah is clearly implied. Luke, however, does not pursue this matter because he understands this vision primarily as a sort of parable about the problem of mixing and eating with unclean people (p. 69).

The vision of Peter is an analogy: both forbidden animals and Gentiles are impure and profane. This analogy, as Richard Bauckham (2005) writes, is deeply rooted in the Jewish tradition and 'derives ultimately from Leviticus 20:22-26, where the distinction between pure and impure animals is said to represent that between Israel and the Gentiles' (p. 104). The Jewish food laws were intended to keep Israel socially separate and symbolise the differentiation from immoral gentiles. This is a view repeated in the letter of Aristaeus: Eleazar explains that Moses "surrounded us with unbroken palisades and iron walls to prevent our mixing with any of the other peoples in any matter" (139) and that "to prevent our being perverted by contact with others or by mixing with bad influences, he hedged us in on all sides with strict observances connected with meat and drink" (142) (Bauckham, 2005, p. 106).

Therefore, God abolishes the separation of Israel from the Gentiles by the symbolic reversal of the Torah's command to "make a distinction" between pure and impure animals. Although Cornelius is an 'upright and God-Fearing man who is well spoken of by the whole Jewish nation', he still would have been considered as morally impure and profane. As Magnus Zetterholm (2005) writes:

It is most likely that the fears concerning Cornelius's impurity originated from his involvement in Roman religion. Although Acts 10:2 presents him as a pious God-fearer who "gave alms generously to the people and prayed constantly to God", the information that he was a Roman officer makes it impossible to imagine that he was not involved in any cultic activities that, from a Jewish perspective, must have been defined as idolatry (p. 8).

At Cornelius' house, Peter tells him of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and while he is speaking the Holy Spirit falls upon those Gentiles. What Peter learns from this is

clear: the blessing of the spirit has been given to Gentiles as well as Jews who believe in Jesus Christ; they have both had been purified of their moral impurity (). What was unexpected, however, was not that Gentiles had repented and had been purified of their moral impurity, but that they had been purified and declared holy without becoming Jews (i.e. without circumcision and submission to the Torah) (). They had been included in the eschatological people of God as Gentiles, and had an equal covenant status with Jewish believers in Jesus Christ; a status previously only available to proselytes or Jewish converts. Shared table fellowship between Jewish and Gentile believers is symbolic of the equal status that they now could share with Jewish believers in the covenant.

2.2.2 The Apostolic Decree (Acts 15): Gentiles accepted as Gentiles, but with a minimum set of requirements

The apostolic council is held in response to the teaching of some Judeans that insisted on circumcision “according to the custom of Moses” as a condition of salvation. Paul and Barnabas were appointed to go up to Jerusalem to discuss the question with the apostles and elders. There are two kinds of arguments made: (a) the experiential argument of Peter, Paul and Barnabas that the miraculous reception of the Holy Spirit which accompanied the conversion of Gentiles constituted a declaration by God that they were acceptable to him as Gentiles (15:8-9; 11;-12); (b) the scriptural argument of James that the prophets predicted that the gentiles would join the eschatological people of God as gentiles (15:15-19). For James, the terms of the apostolic decree (15:28-29; 21:25) are the requirements that the Torah makes of gentile’s members of the eschatological people of God.

The speech of Peter (Acts 15:7-11)

Peter alludes back to the Cornelius (acts 15:7-9), when God demonstrated that he made no distinction between Jews and Gentiles, by pouring out the holy spirit on Gentiles and cleansing their hearts by faith. If God had already revealed his plan to embrace Gentiles, the believers would be rebelling against his will by hindering this purpose. This leads in part to a disqualification of the role of the law: the Torah is a 'a yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear' (Acts 15:10). As the law is impossible to abide by, it was impossible as means of salvation. Therefore, whereas the brothers from Judea declared that without circumcision "you cannot be saved" (Acts 15:1), Peter concludes by affirming that "we believe that we are saved by the grace of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 15:11). In other words, there is no soteriological distinction between Jews and Gentile: both are saved by the grace of the Lord Jesus and have received the spirit. But this does not eradicate any ethical distinction within body: Jews can live Jews (under the law); Gentiles can live as Gentiles (without the law). Barnabas and Paul affirm Peter's viewpoint by retelling the signs and wonders that God had done among many Gentiles.

The Speech of James (Acts 15:13-21)

The clinching argument, provided by James, is that the prophets, when they predicted the Gentiles would join the eschatological people of God, made it clear that they would do so as Gentiles. He quotes from Amos 9:11-12 in support this position. It is, however, a conflated quotation, combining the LXX text of Amos 9:11-12 with allusions to other, related texts. The book of Amos (dated about 765-760 BC) is concerned with the northern kingdom of Israel preceding the Assyrian invasion. The central section consists of words warning and woe pronouncements for Israel (3:1-6:14) and there are a series of visions to reinforce the notion that judgement will not be forestalled (7:1-8:3). But there is a final added note of "salvation" (9:9-15): a

remnant will be spared and a restoration is envisioned. There will be a return from exile; God will “restore the fortunes of my people Israel, and they shall rebuild the ruined cities and inhabit them; they shall plant vineyards and drink their wine” (9:14). The prophet in Amos 9:11-12 anticipated a time when God will (a) raise up the fallen tent of David which will in turn (b) draw the nations to the Lord.

The raising of David’s “hut” or “tent” implies the restoration of David’s house or dynasty and the nation of Israel, so dilapidated by the captivity that it is called a “hut”. Luke – Acts affirms the fulfilment of David’s line in Jesus and the formation of a restored remnant of Israel. The purpose of this restoration, however, is not simply to bless Israel but also “that the rest of humanity may seek the lord”. The value of Amos 9:11-12 in James’ argument depends here precisely on the LXX text where it differs from the MT. Rather than “in order that they might possess the remnant of Edom” (MT) we find “in order that the rest of mankind might seek (the lord)” (LXX) (Bauckham, 1995, p. 155). Whereas the MT implies the conquest of neighbouring lands (alluding to the glorious days of David’s kingdom in 2 Sam 8:1-14 and echoing the conquest of Edom in Obadiah), the LXX implies a conversion of the Gentiles. The LXX translator, as Paul Tanner (2012) notes, “might have been influenced in his thinking by an eschatological and messianic passage such as Isa 11:10: “they *in that day* (בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא) the *nations* (גּוֹיִם) will *resort to* (יִדְרְשׁוּ) the root of Jesse, who will stand as a signal for the peoples; and His resting place will be glorious (p. 73).”

The reason James has chosen Amos 9:11-12, and not other related texts which speak of a pilgrimage of the Gentile nations to Zion (e.g., Isa 2:2-4; Mic 4:1-3; Isa 66:8; Zech 8:20-23), is that Amos 9:11-12 clearly implies that they will join the eschatological people of God as Gentiles. This is the significance of the phrase: ‘all the nations over whom my name has been invoked’. According to Walter C. Kaiser

(1991), 'the usage of this phrase in the OT always placed each of the objects so designated under divine ownership' (p. 196). As Richard Bauckham (1995) writes:

Israel is the people 'over whom the name of YHWH has been invoked' (Dt 28:10; 2 ch 7:14; Jer 14:9; Dn 9:9; cf. Isa 43:17), whereas the Gentiles are 'those over whom your name has not been invoked' (Isa. 63:19) (p. 457).

Therefore, whereas other texts could be taken to mean that Gentiles would be proselytes, undergoing circumcision and full obedience to the mosaic law, this text from Amos 9:11-12 provides the exegetical basis for maintaining that Gentile Christians are not obligated to do so, and precisely as 'all the nations' they are included in the covenant relationship.

Apostolic Decree (Acts 15:20, 29)

The question when it comes to the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15:20, 29 has been (a) the source of these prohibitions and (b) how it relates to James' scriptural argument from Amos 9:11-12 and the view that Gentile Christians are full members of the Eschatological people of God without observance to the Mosaic Law.

(a) Source of the Prohibitions

The common opinion since the influential publication of Han Waitz (1936) has been that the four prohibitions derive from Leviticus 17-18 which apply not only to Israel but also to the גֵּר ("resident aliens") living in the midst of Israel. They correspond to the four prohibitions of the Apostolic decree, in the order in which they occur in the Apostolic letter (Acts 15:29; cf. 21:25): (1) 'Things sacrificed to idols' are prohibited in Leviticus 17:8-9; (2) 'Blood' is prohibited in Leviticus 17:10, 12; (3) 'Things strangled' are prohibited in Leviticus 17:13; (4) 'sexual immorality' refers to Leviticus 18:26, where all sexual relations specified in Leviticus 18:6-26 (relations with menstruating

women, adultery, homosexual intercourse, bestiality) are prohibited. There has been, however, two other proposed views for the source of the prohibitions.

Firstly, scholars have argued that there is a resemblance to the later rabbinic tradition of the Noachide commandments. The later rabbis held Gentiles responsible not for keeping the Mosaic law given to Israel but for keeping a few requirements that God had given to all humanity – namely, laws given up to the time of Noah, from whom all people were descended. The first explicit mention of this tradition is found in Tosefta 'Abodah Zarah 8.4:

'Seven commandments were given to the children of Noah: regarding the establishments of courts of justice, idolatry, blasphemy, fornication, bloodshed, theft [and the torn limb]'

Markus Bockmuehl writes that this 'certainly dates from before the third century; and the fact that Rabbi Meir (fl.c.130-60) comments on it in the immediate context makes a date in the first half of the second century highly probable'. An earlier example of the Noahide laws can be found in the book of Jubilees (7.20), which attributes to Noah several ethical requirements.

Secondly, some scholars have argued that the purpose of the prohibitions of the apostolic decree was to discourage Christians from any connection with the idolatrous worship of pagan cults. As Ben Witherington (2003) writes:

Early Jews believed that the place where one would find meat offered to idols, blood, things strangled, and sexual immorality was a pagan temple (2 Macc 6:4-5). In essence, James is arguing what Paul later would argue in 1 Corinthians 8-10: Christian converts, even Gentiles ones, must stay away from pagan temples (p. 247).

Kummel seeks confirmation for this in later Christian literature, especially the pseudo-Clementine's. The two most important passages which prohibit participation in the 'table of demons' (Hom. VII.8.1; Rec.IV.36.4), link participation in pagan sacrificial meals to a list of things, three of the terms of the decree, including... [blood]. A similar way of explaining the prohibitions for ... and ... has been found in Origen. Origen notes that idols food is offered to demons and that blood – especially its odour – is demon food, and that eating strangled animals (which have their blood in them) is akin to dining with demon spirits (Celsus 8.30). The notion that demons were attracted by the odour blood and that blood is the food of demons, is also found in Justin Apol. 2.5; Tertullian Apol. 22.6; 23.14.

Nonetheless, these two proposed sources of the Apostolic Decree are not necessarily mutually exclusive from the view that they derive from Leviticus 17-18. The Noahide laws themselves depend on and develop themes in Leviticus 17-18. The resemblances between the Noahide laws, Leviticus 17-18 and Acts 15:20, 29 does not stem from mere coincidence. Likewise, whilst the prohibitions are derived from law for the Sojourners living in the land in Leviticus 17-18, they could be interpreted as a rejection of idolatrous pagan cultic practises. For example, the early Christian writers combined all proposed sources in their interpretation. Tertullian, for example, regards blood as the food of demons (Apol 22.6;23.14), but explains it further by reference to the Noahic prohibition (De Mon. 5) and Leviticus 17-18 (Apol 9.13). Likewise, Pseudo-Clementine literature links participation in pagan sacrificial meals to the terms of the decree (Hom. VII.8.1; Rec.IV.36.4), but also makes use of Leviticus 17-18 to elaborate the decree (Clem. Hom. 7.8; 11.28; Clem. Rec. 6.10). Nonetheless, as Craig S. Keener (2014) has recognized, if these regulations simply concerned temple feasts, "15:20 is an unusual way to put; the simple prohibition "Do

not attend temple feasts" would be much more direct and would cause less confusion" (2014, p. 2261).

Therefore, the most plausible explanation is that prohibitions derive from the laws from sojourner living within the land Leviticus 17-18. Nonetheless, three arguments that have been used to weaken this hypothesis. Firstly, as Ben Witherington (1998) writes, 'all of Leviticus 17-18 is address to Israel and to strangers who live within the holy land. The decree is for Gentiles in the Diaspora (p. 465).' Nonetheless, whilst the passage is address to Gentiles living within the land, it offered principles that could be applied to evaluating righteous Gentiles, which is certainly the case with the Rabbinic Noahide Laws which establish a set of principles for gentiles (regardless of whether they live within Israel or not) and draw on principles from Leviticus 17-18.

Secondly, as S.G Wilson (2005) observes, there are other commands of the law which apply also to "strangers in the land". They are enjoined to keep the sabbath in Ex. 20:10; 23:12; Dt. 5:14, and the day of atonement in Lev 16:29 – neither of which is mentioned in the decree (p. 86). We may add to this that they must be circumcised to eat the Passover (Ex. 12:48-9). Deuteronomy 31:12 even suggests that in some way the sojourner was expected to obey all the law. Nonetheless, Richard Bauckham (1996) has shown that the four prohibitions correspond to the four things that are prohibited to "the alien who sojourns in your/their midst" in Leviticus 17-18. Although other laws applied to resident aliens (such as the Sabbath in Ex 20:10; 23:12; Dt 5:14), "in your midst" is the connection linking the other laws. Besides the laws in Leviticus 17-18, the only laws in the Torah, which the resident alien 'in the midst' of Israel is obliged to obey are Leviticus 16.29; Numbers 15.14-15, 29; 19.10, but these refer to the temple cult. Given that Jewish Christian understood the eschatological

temple as the Christian community, it is understandable that an exegete 'would not apply these laws literally to Gentile converts' (p. 176).

Lastly, there is a problem of the connection between the decree and Leviticus 17-18. The specific prohibitions in Leviticus addressed to strangers correspond exactly to the Jerusalem decree's list only regarding the blood (using the exact term αἷματος, Lev 17:10-13) and various kinds of sexual immorality (without using the exact term πορνείας, 18:6-26). S.G. Wilson (2005) describes as 'curious' the use of the term εἰδωλόθυτος to summarise Lev 17:1-9, which deals with the appropriate location of sacrifices (p. 87). Nonetheless, the rationale for this is clear: some Israelites were adopting the practise of some of their neighbours and offering it 'outside the camp' to "goat demons" (v.7), which would be idolatrous. Therefore, sacrifices not brought to the tabernacles are not offered to YHWH but to idols.

What remains problematic is the use of πνικτός to summarise Lev 17:13-14. If πνικτός means 'strangled' it is presumably a refinement of the prohibition of blood, referring to the blood remaining in the animals slaughtering in this fashion. S.G. Wilsons (2005) has argued that it 'remains unclear why this particular refinement is mentioned together with the prohibition of blood, insofar as it has no basis in Lev.17. (p. 91)' Richard Bauckham (1995) has argued, however, that the 'difficulty with this term in the apostolic decree has arisen simply because Leviticus 17:13 is a positive prescription: that animals killed for eating must be slaughtered in such as that that blood drains out. Abstention from πνικτά is a negative corollary, for an animal killed in such a way that the blood remains in it is 'choked'" (p. 459). An example of this interpretation of the passage can be found in Phil Spec. 4.122; in the context of a discussion of hunting (4.120-121), Philo castigated 'some of the type of sardanapalus', who 'prepare meat unfit for the later by strangling and throttling the

animals, and entomb in the carcase the blood which is the essence of the soul and should be allowed to run freely'. The implication is clear: meat from which blood has not been drained is meat killed by 'strangling and choking'.

(b) Exegetical link to Amos 9:11-12

The four prohibitions correspond to the fourth things that are prohibited to the "the alien who sojourns in your/their midst" in Leviticus 17-18. Richard Bauckham has argued that the reason they are selected is exegetical. The Amos 9:11-12 quotation is a conflicted text, the opening words Μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω ('after these things I will return') and the last words γινωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος ('things known from long ago') are allusions to other prophetic texts (Hos 3:5; Jer 12:15; Isa 45:21) which are closely related to Amos 9:11-12, both in subject matter (it relates to the inclusion of the Gentiles in the messianic age) and by verbal resemblances. Another prophecy closely related to this and to Amos 9:11-12 uses similar phraseology: 'many nations shall flee for refuge to the Lord in that day, and shall be his people, and they shall dwell in your midst' (Zech 2:11). The term "the alien who sojourns in your/ their midst" links the prohibitions in Leviticus 17-18 to Jeremiah 12:16/ Zechariah 2:11 (via the quotation of Amos 9:11-12) which explains the selection of these stipulations in the Apostolic Decree.

Secondly, these prohibitions are those which Leviticus 18:24-30 could be understood to refer to, that is, the moral impurities of the Canaanites that it exhorts the Israelites not to follow as it would defile themselves and the land. If God has, as Peter claims, "purified their [the gentiles'] hearts by faith", these are the impurities which they to be pure of. Therefore, the Apostolic Decree exhorts the gentile Christians to avoid the

moral impurities from Leviticus 17-18 which would otherwise impede shared table fellowship between Jews and Gentiles in the church.

2.2.3 Summary and Conclusion

Within second-Temple Judaism there is, on the one hand, an exclusion of the gentiles. They were both profane and morally impure and close association with Gentiles (through intermarriage and shared table fellowship) is prohibited. But there is, besides this negative vision of the gentile nations, a positive outlook for the inclusion of the Gentiles nations at the Eschaton, when they would be incorporated into the people of God. There is a cause-and-effect sequence envisaged: first Israel's vindication, and then the pilgrimage of the gentiles to Zion. Nonetheless, it is unclear within this picture whether these gentiles would participate in the blessings of the end-times as proselytes or as "God fearers".

Therefore, in Acts, the Eschaton has arrived: Jesus the Messiah restored a remnant of Israel; the corollary of which is that the Gentiles have been accepted into the Eschatological people of God without becoming proselytes (i.e. without circumcision and observance of the Mosaic Law). This is the lesson Peter learns in Acts 10-11: the blessing of the spirit has been given to Gentiles as well as Jews who believe in Jesus Christ; both had been purified of their moral impurity. As a result, there are no barriers to table fellowship between Jewish and Gentile believers. Finally, James' argument is that the prophets, when they predicted the Gentiles would join the eschatological people of God, made it clear that they would do so as Gentiles *but* that they must keep a minimum set of requirements as proscribed by Torah: 'to abstain only from things polluted by idols and from fornication and from whatever has been strangled and from blood' (15:20, 29).

These four prohibitions correspond to the four things that are prohibited to the “the alien who sojourns in your/their midst” in Leviticus 17-18 and could be understood to refer to the moral impurities of the Canaanites that it exhorts the Israelites not to follow in Leviticus 18:24-30, as it would defile themselves and the land. Therefore, the Apostolic Council established that Gentiles were acceptable to God without becoming proselytes, but exhorted them to keep this set of requirements to avoid the moral impurities from Leviticus 17-18 which would otherwise impede shared table fellowship between Jews and Gentiles in the church.

Chapter 3: Paul and the Apostolic Decree

There is, in my opinion, three issues which arise from this account of the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15 and the Pauline Corpus: (1) the relation between the Jerusalem council and Paul's accounts in Galatians 2:1-14; (2) the Jewish/ Gentile divide at the heart of the Apostolic Decree; (3) Paul's attitude towards Apostolic Decree in Acts 15:20, 29 and the four prohibitions binding on Gentile believers.

3.1 The First Issue: Paul's Account of the Apostolic Council in Galatians (2:1-10)

The majority of scholar have identified Acts 15 with Galatians 2:1-10. The most significant difference, however, is Paul's omission of the decree of Acts 15:20, 28-29, although it was the primary outcome of the meeting. In fact, Paul says that "they asked only one thing, that we remember the poor", referring to the collection for the poor in Jerusalem. If there were any other requirements, he does not appear to mention it. Moreover, the events of the Antioch Incident in Galatians 2:11-14 are difficult to envisage as occurring after the promulgation of the decree. For many scholars, the Decree is the solution to the Antiochene conflict reported by Paul in Gal 2: 11-14, and should have been agreed upon after and not before the clash. This has led to a marked scepticism regarding the account of the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15. As Bornkamm (1971) writes: "Paul's account makes it quite certain that the 'Apostolic Decree' can never have been part of the resolutions of the assembly (p. 42)."

3.1.1 Addressed to North or South Galatia?

Most scholars throughout church history have agreed that Paul wrote Galatians to the churches of North Galatia. The only recorded occasion on which Paul could have founded the churches of North Galatia is on the so-called second missionary journey, in the period referred to in Acts 16:6 after the council at Jerusalem. On this view

Paul returned to the churches of North Galatia on his third missionary journey, in the period referred to in Acts 18:23. Therefore, if Paul wrote to the churches of North Galatia, Galatians must be dated after the Apostolic Council (between 50 & 57 AD), and the meeting described in Galatians 2:1-10 must be the same council described in Acts 15.

Nonetheless, this North Galatians hypothesis has been challenged by scholars such as Ramsay (1997 , pp. 68-77) , F.F Bruce (2013, pp. 3-18), Ralph Martin (1999, pp. 148-52), Richard Longenecker (1990), Frank Matera (1992, pp. 19-26), Douglas Moo (2013 , pp. 4-8) and Donald Hagner (2012, p. 437). The argument that Galatians was written to North Galatia has lost much of its force largely due to the archaeological efforts of Sir William Ramsey in the 19th century which has shown that North and South Galatia were once part of the same province. As F.F Bruce (1969) writes:

In the second century (c. A.D. 137) Lycaonia Galatia was detached and united with Cilicia and Isaurica to form an enlarged province, and towards the end of the third century (c. 297) the remainder of South Galatia with some adjoining territories became a new province of Pisidia, with Pisidian Antioch as its capital and Iconium as its second city. The province of Galatia was thus reduced to North Galatia (p. 247).

Therefore, when the early church fathers read the word "Galatia" they understood it in the sense familiar to their day. Those who lived in subsequent generations, as Thomas Schreiner (2011) writes, 'did not realize that south and north Galatia were part of the same province when Paul wrote the letter, and this many explain the dominance of the north Galatia hypothesis historically (p. 26)'.

Furthermore, although the reference to 'Galatia' in Acts 16:6 and 18:23 has been thought bolster the North Galatian hypothesis, there is a lack of evidence that Paul established any churches or engaged in evangelistic ministry. As Polhill (1972) states, "South Galatian adherents will always find it difficult to conceive of the relative silence in Acts about a group of churches to which Paul addresses a letter with such apparent familiarity" (p. 443). In fact, Stephen Mitchel (1993) has argued that there is a lack of evidence that 'Galatia' in Acts 16:6 and 18:23 refers to the north of the province:

There is virtually nothing to be said for the North Galatian theory. There is no evidence in Acts or in any non-testamentary source that Paul ever evangelized the region of Ancyra and Pessinus, in person, by letter, or by any other means (p. 3).

The use of the names "Phrygia and Galatia" in Acts 16:6 and 18:23 may be adjectival, thus referring to the area of the Galatian province that includes the region of Phrygia. The Northern Galatian hypothesis would require an unnatural detour in Acts 16, in which normal trade routes would not have been followed. North Galatia does not fit geographically because it "lay some 200km [125 miles] NE of any natural route between Lystra and Mysia in NW Asia Minor" (Mitchel, 1992, p. 871). Likewise, the route in 18:23 is not conceivable in N Galatia, as it would have involved a huge detour between Syrian Antioch and Ephesus.

Therefore, given the lack of evidence that Paul established any churches in North Galatia or even visited this region, it is more likely that Galatians was written to the churches in South Galatia. Paul and Barnabas had after all established churches in the cities of Roman province of south Galatia (Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, and

Derbe) on their first missionary journey (Acts 13: 4 – 14:28). There are two arguments that have been used to bolster South Galatia theory. Firstly, Paul and Barnabas were only together on their first missionary journey (Acts 13: 4 – 14:28) and therefore it makes sense that Barnabas would have been known to the churches in this region as is indicated in Galatians (2:1,9,13). Secondly, the letter to the Galatians is a polemical letter against Judaizers that were seeking to impose the Law on Gentile converts. Guthrie (1970) has argued that this favours a southern destination as it was more plausible that they had followed him through the southern region, rather than travelling to the isolated districts in the north Galatia.

3.1.2 Early Composition of Galatians

If Galatians is addressed to the churches of South Galatia it permits an early date to the composition of Galatians (late forties or early fifties), but it does not necessitate it. There are two main arguments which have been used to support a late composition of Galatians. First, the close relationship between Galatians and Romans has led many scholars, like J.B. Lightfoot (1910), to prefer a date for Galatians not far removed from Romans. For example, there is a strong instance on Justification, with a similar citation of Habakkuk 12.5 (Rom 1:17), and appeal to the precedent of Abraham (Gen 15.6, quoted in Gal 3.6; Rom 4.3). Nonetheless, the thematic similarity of Galatians and Romans may reflect, as David Wenham writes, 'not a closeness of date, but similarity of situation'. As James D.G Dunn (2009) has recognised, similarity in thought only requires a closeness in composition if we 'assume a volatility in Paul's theologizing which goes well beyond the evidence of his writings themselves' (p. 720). We can just as well argue that Paul's theology on the law remained stable over his lifetime. As F.F. Bruce (2013) writes: "Paul may equally

well have reproduced in Romans some of the distinctive positions of Galatians whether Galatians was written one year or ten years before" (p. 46).

The strongest argument for a late composition of Galatians has been the relationship between Acts 15 and Gal 2:1-10. At both meetings circumcision was debated and the apostles decided that circumcision was not required for Gentiles. If they're describing the same meeting, Galatians must have been after the Jerusalem Council. The problem with this is that the meeting in Gal 2:1-10 is of a different nature to the council: the former was a private meeting (Gal 2:2); while the latter was a public discussion (Acts 15:6). Moreover, it is difficult to envisage the Antioch Incident in Galatians 2:11-14 as occurring after the promulgation of the decree Acts 15.

The incident at antioch came to head over the issue of table fellowship: Peter, Barnabas, and other Jewish Christians ate openly with Gentile Christians until certain people associated with James arrived at Antioch. Food was not the problem but the nature of commonality – too close a relationship between Jews and Gentiles. It is possible that Paul's response to peter contains catchwords from the circumcision faction's accusation, for instance, the claim not to be a "gentile sinner" in Galatians 2:15. This may well be part of the critique of the circumcision faction: by socialising with impure "gentile sinners", they ran the risk of becoming "gentile sinners" themselves. If so, Paul's reference in 2:14 to "live like a Gentile" makes sense as an ironic allusion to the allegations. Thus, the demand of the circumcision faction is quite clear: circumcision and obedience to the Mosaic Law as necessary requirement for Gentile believers to be considered morally pure and share table fellowship with Jewish believers.

Nevertheless, the Apostolic council in Acts 15 had already established (a) that Gentiles believers were full members of the Eschatological people of God without circumcision and observance to the Mosaic Law; and (b) they had exhorted Gentiles to avoid the moral impurities from Leviticus 17-18 in Acts 15:20, 29 which would have otherwise impeded shared table fellowship between Jews and Gentiles in the church. Thus, if Galatians was written after the Apostolic Council, Paul simply had to remind Peter of this decision for which he was party. According to Longenecker this would have served the coup de grace to the conflict in Galatia. In other words, Peter's lapse in Galatians 2:11-14 makes very little sense after the Apostolic council of Acts 15 when these matters had been ironed out and an authoritative ruling had been established.

Thus, it is more likely in my opinion that Galatians was written immediately prior to the Apostolic Council in Acts 15 and that the crisis in Antioch (Gal 2:11-14) was the occasion for it, i.e. the agreement made at Apostolic Council in Acts 15 restored a shared table fellowship which had broken down after the Antioch incident in Galatians 2:11-14. As Ronald Y.K. Fung (1988) writes:

Galatians may well have been written on the eve of the Jerusalem Council (ca. A.D. 48) – as soon as or not long after news had reached Paul that the judaizing propagandists, whose activities in Antioch and its daughter-churches in Syria and Cilicia had given rise to the necessity for a conference between Paul and Barnabas and the Jerusalem leaders (Acts 15:1-2, 23), had extended their subversive activity into the churches of South Galatia (p. 28).

In support of this proposal there is remarkable similarity between the Antioch Incident (Gal 2:11-21) and the controversy which led to the Apostolic Council in 15:1-2: (a)

both were provoked by the arrival in Antioch of certain people from Judea/ James (Gal 2:2; Acts 15:1); and (b) both the 'circumcision party' and the 'certain individuals' from Judea shared the teaching that 'unless you are circumcised according to the law of Moses, you cannot be saved' (Gal 2:12; Acts 15:1).

But if the Antioch Incident (Gal 2:11-21) immediately preceded the Jerusalem council in Acts 15, what meeting is described in Galatians 2:1-10? Important is the autobiographic account in Galatians 1-2, which stipulates the two times he visited Jerusalem (1:18; 2:1): the first, three years after his conversion, and the second, fourteen years after his conversion or previous visit. According to Acts, however, Paul visited Jerusalem twice before the Jerusalem Council (9:26; 11:29-30). If Acts is correct, Galatians 2:1-10 must be equated with the famine visit of Acts 11:29-30. There are at least two main similarities between these visits: (i) they both concur with the idea of going up to Jerusalem because of a revelation (Gal 2:2; Acts 11:28); and (ii) the purpose of the Acts visit was to relieve the hungry, and Galatians 2:10 alludes to the importance of remembering the poor, which Paul says, "I had been eager to do".

The problem is that Luke in Acts 11:29-30; 12:25 does not make mention of this consultation Gal 2:1-10. Nonetheless, there may be good reasons for this. Firstly, the 'official' business was the famine relief, with the discussions about Paul's ministry being a side-issue. Secondly, the decision reached was only a temporary solution, as exemplified by the incident at Antioch, and was superseded by a more authoritative decision at the Jerusalem council (Acts 15). As such, it was unnecessary for Luke to mention this meeting. Nonetheless, if a decision on the issue of circumcision been reached been reached at the meeting in Gal 2:10, why would there be need for a further council in Acts 15? In response, Richard Bauckham (2005) writes:

It is not difficult to think of reasons why the agreement reached in a private meeting by the group of five leaders should have been contested, so that the matter had to be discussed and resolved in a plenary session of the Jerusalem council, involving all of the Christians leaders who could attend, and resulting in the promulgation of an authoritative ruling to all the churches (p. 136).

Moreover, the discussion with 'the pillars' (2:1-10) had only resolved the question of circumcision. As exemplified by the crisis in Antioch (2:11-21), it had not resolved the related question of table fellowship between Jewish and Gentile believers, which the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15:20, 29 had resolved.

Nonetheless, even if the meeting of 'the pillars' (2:1-10) and the Antioch Incident (2:11-14) preceded the Jerusalem council in Acts 15, Peter's behaviour of not eating with Gentile believers is somewhat problematic. For one, the point of the Cornelius incident in Acts 10-11 was that Peter could eat with Gentiles and that he should not call anyone "profane or unclean" (Acts 10:28). Nevertheless, Peter was accustomed to eating with Gentiles, although it was forbidden (Acts 11:3), but had only kept himself separate 'for fear of the circumcision faction' (Gal 2:12). In fact, Paul does not accuse Peter of heresy but of hypocrisy (2:13): Peter recognised that "a man is not justified by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ" (Gal 2:16). Given Peter's position at Apostolic Council in Acts 15, he must have recognised the error of ways. As a matter of fact, Luke's presentation of Peter's contribution in Acts 15:7-11 is somewhat similar to Paul's argument in Galatians: both emphasize that God gave the uncircumcised Gentiles the spirit and that there is no need for them to be circumcised or to submit to the law of Moses (Acts 15:5-7; Gal 3:2, 5); both insist that there is no distinctions between Jews and Greeks (Acts

15:9; Gal 3:28, 5:6) and that God's saving activity achieves moral purity of the heart (Acts 15:10-11; Gal 5:1, 6:13, 3:12, 2:16-21).

3.1.3 Summary and Conclusion

Based on the 'North Galatian' hypothesis most scholars agreed that Galatians must be dated after the Apostolic Council (between 50 & 57 AD), and that the meeting described in Galatians 2:1-10 must be the same council described in Acts 15. Nonetheless, we now know that south and north Galatia were part of the same province when Paul wrote the letter and that there is a lack of evidence from Acts 16:6 and 18:23 that Paul established any churches or he even visited North Galatia. Thus, it is more likely that Galatians was written to the churches of South Galatia, where Paul established churches on his first missionary journey (Acts 13: 4 – 14:28). This permits an early date to the composition of Galatians (late forties or early fifties), but it does not necessitate it. The strongest argument for the late composition of Galatians has been the relationship between Acts 15 and Gal 2:1-10. Nonetheless, it is almost impossible to envisage the Antioch Incident in Galatians 2:11-14 as occurring after the Apostolic Council in Acts 15. The demands of the circumcision faction are quite clear: circumcision and obedience to the Mosaic Law as a necessary requirement for Gentile believers to be considered morally pure, and thereby share table fellowship with Jewish believers. The Apostolic council in Acts 15 had already agreed that Gentiles believers were full members of God's people without circumcision and exhorted Gentiles to avoid the moral impurities from Leviticus 17-18 in Acts 15:20, 29 which would have otherwise impeded shared table fellowship between Jews and Gentiles in the church. Thus, if Galatians were written after the Apostolic Council in Acts 15, Paul simply had to remind Peter of this decision for which he was party.

Therefore, it is more likely that Galatians was written immediately prior to the Apostolic Council in Acts 15 (around A.D. 48) and that the crisis in Antioch (Gal 2:11-14) was the occasion for it, i.e. the agreement made at Apostolic Council in Acts 15 restored a shared table fellowship which had broken down after the Antioch incident in Galatians 2:11-14. On this view, we must identify Galatians 2:1-10 with a separate meeting from the Apostolic Council in Acts 15. Given Paul's autobiographic account in Galatians 1-2, Galatians 2:1-10 must be equated with the famine visit of Acts 11:29-30. Thus, at this private meeting with 'the pillars' the issue of Circumcision was discussed, but at the public meeting in Acts 15 an authoritative ruling was established which fully resolved the circumcision issue as well as the corresponding issue of shared table fellowship between Jewish and Gentile believers.

3.2 The Second Issue: Jewish/ Gentile divide at the heart of the Apostolic Decree

The second issue is the Jewish/ Gentile divide at the heart of the Apostolic Decree in Acts 15. The common opinion since the influential publication of Han Waitz (1936) has been that the four prohibitions derive from Leviticus 17-18 which apply not only to Israel but also to the גֵּר ("resident aliens") living in the midst of Israel. On this basis David Catchpole (1977) sets two theological presuppositions of the decree: (i) the requirements are "fundamentally mosaic", that is, the Gentile Christian keep the part of the law which applied to them, and correspondingly, the Jews keep the law in a "more extensive sense"; and (ii) following from this, that the theology underlying the Decree is "one which sees the Christian gospel as doing nothing about the Jew/ Gentile distinction. That is, Jews remain Jews, and Gentiles remain Gentiles (p. 430)." For David Catchpole (1977) these theological presuppositions would have

been "repugnant to Paul". Firstly, at the centre of Paul's theology there is a polemic against the Mosaic law, which meant that it no longer carried any positive or practical meaning. It was a temporary incursion which 'ended with the arrival or revelation of Christ and faith (Gal 3: 6-29)'. Secondly, Christians are controlled by corporate participation 'in Christ Jesus' (Gal 3:8), ending the old Jewish/ Gentile distinction (p. 430).

The question has been whether Paul (as the Apostolic Decree) maintained a distinction in terms of identity and conduct between Jews and Gentile. The so-called new perspective on Paul pioneered by scholars such as E.P Sanders (1977; 1983), James D. G Dunn (1990; 2003) and N. T Wright (1993; 2013) challenged the traditional characterisation of Judaism as legalistic, but has still set Paul in contrast to law-observant Judaism. For them, the primary problem is ethnocentricity: the law set Jews apart from the nations and observance particularly of circumcision, the sabbath and dietary laws functioned as identity markers to distinguish them from non-Jews. As such, Paul resisted this ethnocentricity and preached a gospel free of these distinctly Jewish rites; for them, a new identity 'in Christ' had in some sense transcended a former Jewish or Gentile identity.

On the other hand, proponents of the Radical New Perspective or Paul within Judaism perspective have argued that Paul continued to view Jewish and Gentile believers as people with distinct identities and obligations. Paul only objected to non-Jews observing Torah or to non-Jews becoming Jews and observing Torah on the same terms. Peter Tomson (1990) has argued that Paul's view was that "Jews and gentiles should each stick to their respective way of life" wherein "gentiles kept their minimum set of 'commandments of God' while Jewish Christians kept 'the whole law'" (1990, pp. 267, 269). Markus Bockmuehl (2000) offers a similar argument,

quoting Michael Wyschogrod with approval: "The distinction that needs to be made, therefore, is not between the law before and after Christ, but the law for Jews and Gentiles" (p. 171). Gabrielle Boccoccini (2016) writes:

The New Perspective tries to get rid of the most derogatory aspects of the traditional (lutheran) reading of Paul (claiming that Judaism also should be regarded as a "respectable" religion based on grace), but has not challenged the view of Paul as the critic of Judaism and advocate of a new supersessionist model of relations between God and humankind – God's grace "in Christ" superseded the Jewish Overton for both Jewish and Gentiles creating a third separate "race". A new paradigm is emerging today with the Radical New Perspective – a paradigm that aims to fully rediscover the Jewishness of Paul (p. 2).

This Radical New Perspective or Paul within Judaism perspective has been maintained by scholars such as Peter Tomson (1990), Mark Nanos (1996; 2002), , Lloyd Gaston (2006), Caroline Johnson Hodge (2007; 2015), Pamela Eisenbaum (2009), Kathy Ehrenspergers (2010; 2013), David Rudolph (2016). Drawing on this recent scholarship, it is my contention, contra David Catchpole, that the Mosaic Law carried positive or practical meaning for Paul and that corporate participation 'in Christ Jesus' did not entail Jewish/ Gentile distinction.

3.2.1 Corporate participation 'in Christ Jesus'

Paul's declaration that all converts are one in Christ and its affirmation that there is "no longer Jew or Gentile" (Gal 3:28) or "no distinction" between Jews or Gentile (Rom 10:12) has been used to deny that the ecclesia should distinguish between its Jewish and Gentile members and that the Torah-defined boundary markers

(circumcision, the food laws and the sabbath) have been set aside for Jews and Gentiles in Christ. For example, John Barclay (1996) speaks of a relativizing of former identities and that Pauline communities of Jews and Gentile in some respects abandoned the law altogether. Phillip Elser (2013) concludes that Paul “unambiguously asserts that the Christ followers constituted a third group set over against the Judaic and Gentile worlds (p. 89).”

Paul's corporate Christology functions, as David Horrell (2000) has recognized, as a 'fundamental designation of distinctive group-identity and to structure social interactions within the congregations' (p. 8). The renewal of God's people through the spirit is a call to holiness against the moral impurity of unbelievers, which arises from idolatry and sexual immorality (cf. 1 Thes 4:3-8; Eph 5:3; 1 Cor 5:9-11). As Christine Hayes (2002) writes, “Believers are members of the body of Christ; their bodies, being identified with the body of Christ, are holy bodies” (p. 93). Nonetheless, for Paul, identity is not monolithic. As Brian Tucker (2011) writes:

The concept of hybrid, nested identities provides a significant interpretative framework... Paul does not look to obliterate previous identities; rather he seeks to reprioritise them (p. 53).

Therefore, for Jewish and Gentile Christians their identities and accompanying ethical imperatives remain distinctive. For example, in 1 Cor 7:17-24, Paul emphasises that previous social identities are part of God's call (7:17, 20, 24): whether married to a Christ follower or not, unmarried, a slave, free, or, in 7:19, possessing foreskin or uncircumcised. Likewise, in Romans 14, Paul appreciates that different practises must arise from allegiance to God: those who observe the Sabbath or Kosher rules do so ‘in honour of the Lord’(14:6); whilst those who do not observe

the Sabbath or Kosher rules do so 'in honour of the Lord and give thanks to God'(14:6). As John Barclay (2013) has recognized, there is no suggestion that those following a Jewish way of life should cease to adhere to it, but instead kosher and sabbath observance are compatible with faith in Christ, "whereas participation in idolatry, or in sex with a prostitute, were utterly incompatible with Christ, and could not be performed in honour of Christ or in gratitude to God (1 Cor 6,12–20; 10,14–22)" (p. 200).

In fact, in Romans 14:15-20 Paul puts the demand on non-Torah observant Gentiles to accommodate Torah observant Jews at communal meals. The eating practises of the Gentiles are entirely appropriate, but in certain situations, if a brother/ sister may be injured, he admonishes the Gentiles to accommodate their eating practises to the needs of the "weak" to enable mutual hospitality. This is not a compromise, but precisely the necessary expression of faith in Christ: they must, like Christ, act in love and work for the good of their neighbour (15.1-3), which means not getting the own way, but 'bearing the weaknesses of the powerless'.

Consequently, Paul's "no distinction" language may be taken in a soteriological sense: there is no distinction between Jewish and Gentiles members because they were equally sinners and equally justified through faith in Jesus Christ. Both Jews and Gentiles are "under the power of sin" (Rom 3:9) and both Jews and Gentiles are justified by faith apart from the works prescribed by the law; God has "justified the circumcised on the ground of faith and the uncircumcised through the same faith" (Rom 3:30). Likewise, Galatian 3.28 can be taken, as Gundry Volf (2003) writes, as "denying the presumed significance of fundamental Jewish and Gentile identity markers for inheritance of the eschatological blessings and membership of the people of God (p. 18)." Therefore, "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither

slave and free, male and female", in respect to a common imprisonment to sin and the way of salvation. As Thieseltion (2000) writes:

To remain Jewish or non-Jewish does no spring from general indifference, but form salvific irrelevance. As in the case of gender, such distinctions are not abrogated wholesale... the new creation transforms and relativizes such distinctions, but they have a place (p. 551).

Although gender, class or race have no bearing on salvation, there is not an undifferentiated oneness in Christ; unity does not presuppose all-out sameness.

The problem has been Paul's insistence that circumcision and uncircumcision 'is nothing' (1 Cor 7:19; cf. Gal. 5:6) or the 'kingdom of God is not food or drink' (Rom 14:17). How can Paul at once appraise previous social identities (cf. 1 Cor 7:17-24; Romans 14:6) and speak of them as 'nothing'? According to James D.G. Dunn (2003), Paul's claim is 'that these distinctions have been relativized, not removed' (p. 593). Brian Tucker (2011, p. 78) prefers to read this as a "reprioritization" of social identity "in Christ". In other words, Christians retain their previous identity but some aspects of them (For Jews, circumcision) have diminished in importance. As Gundry Volf (2003) writes:

The point is not that fleshly differences do no persist in the eschatological community, but that they do not and should not 'count'. Jewishness is not essential; Greekness is no disadvantage. Thus within the single people of God neither should Jews become like Gentiles nor Gentiles like Jews, nor both become 'one new humanity which is neither' (with W.S. Campbell 1991: ch.4). For the new unity and equality of the community is attained not through elimination of differences but through their revalorization (p. 21).

Paul interjects, after proclaiming that circumcision or no circumcision is 'nothing', with what is in fact central for Jewish and Gentile Christians alike: "keeping the commandments of God" (1 Cor 7:19) or "faith working through love" (Gal 5:6) or "new creation" (Gal 6:15) or "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom 14:17). These are the core requirements that unite all believers "in Christ".

Moreover, Paul insists in Romans 14:14 that 'nothing is unclean in itself but it is unclean for anyone who thinks it is unclean'. Many exegetes have assumed that this reflects the apostles emancipated view of the Jewish food laws. John Barclay (1996) writes that 'this constitutes nothing less than a fundamental rejection of the Jewish law in one of its most sensitive dimensions (p. 300).' N.T. Wright (2013) writes

"In a breath-taking move, we find Paul arguing... that 'all foods' are basically clean, God-given and to be enjoyed with thanksgiving, and that the matter of what one eats is therefore indifferent... In the light of this, and of Paul's own insistence that he took what he calls the 'strong' position, I find myself in agreement with those who have maintained that Paul did not himself continue to keep kosher laws, and did not propose to, or require of, other 'Jewish Christians' that they should, either (p. 359).

Tomson (1990, p. 251) has recognized, however, that this statement does not necessarily represent a fundamental rejection of the Jewish law. He cites Yohanan ben Zakki's reason for ritual purity with the red heifer (Num. 19): 'By our lives! A corpse would not render impure, nor water purify, were it not for the decree of the Holy one, blessed be he.' The implication is clear: the distinction between pure and impure comes through the law rather than by nature. As Kathy Ehrensperger (2010) writes:

The impure animals are impure of the covenant people, as is emphasized in an almost mantra-like manner in Leviticus 11: 'it is unclean/ impure for you' (11.4, 5, 6, 7); 'they are unclean for you' (11.8); 'they are untouchable for you' (11.10-11, 12, 23) etc. As with other regulations, these apply to the covenant partner Israel and not to the nations (p. 106).

Thus, when Paul maintained that nothing is unclean in itself, he is upholding that it is not an inherent ontological category. In other words, the Jewish food laws are regulations related to God's covenant for people of Israel, and not the Gentile believers. If purity and impurity regulations were inherent ontological categories – and not imputed in the Torah for the Jewish people – then the Gentile believers would be expected to obey them.

What needs to be clarified is why Paul addressed the difference among the Roman believers as a matter of strength or weakness in faith (14, 1-2; 15, 1). The traditional interpretations have assumed that Paul regarded the Torah observant as "weak" and non-Torah-observant as "strong", and that their weakness lay in their continued Torah observance which had been superseded with the coming of Christ. It is certainly the case that the "weak" were kosher and sabbath observant, but their weakness derives not from a Torah observance but may derive from a view that purity rules were an objective ontological category and following from this a judgemental approach to non-kosher and sabbath observant Gentile Christians (Rom 14:3-4). Their condemnation implied that the "strong" should be required to live in full compliance with the Jewish law. In other words, they rejected the decision reached in Jerusalem by James, Peter and John. For Paul, the "weak" must accept that others do not need to integrate their faith in Christ with Kosher or Sabbath observance, and therefore stop passing judgement on their brothers and sisters. On the other hand,

the “strong” insist that they (as Gentiles) have no obligation to keep the Jewish kosher rules or sabbath. In agreement with Paul, they reject purity regulations as an objective ontological reality. Nevertheless, they “despise” their Jewish associates beliefs and practises. Instead, Paul’s on them to act in love and work for the good of their neighbour (15.1-3).

3.2.2 Paul and obedience to the Mosaic Law

It has been argued that there is at the centre of Paul’s theology a polemic against the Mosaic law, which meant that it no longer carried any positive or practical meaning. For example, Paul tells us that he has been redeemed them from the curse of the law (Gal 3:13); has died to the law (Rom 7:11; Gal 2:19); is freed from the law (Rom 7:6); and is no longer under the law (Rom 6:14). The traditional view has built on 1 Cor 9:19-23 to present Paul’s Torah obedience and Jewishness as a variable depending on social context. As D.A.Carson (1986) writes:

Paul occupies a third ground and, as far as law is concerned, is prepared to move from that ground to become like a Jew or like a Gentile, because in his relationship to Torah he is neither one nor the other. This is also explains why Paul could be charged with being antinomians by some of his contemporaries – because his understanding of God’s redemptive purposes in history left Torah quo covenant superseded (p. 37).

Barrett (1968) contends that Paul’s “Judaism was no longer of his very being, but a guise he could adapt or discard at will (p. 211).” It is assumed that Paul occasionally adopted Jewish practises so that Jews would listen to his message, such as in Acts when he had Timothy circumcised (Acts 16:3), made a Nazerites vow (Acts 18:18), and joined four other Nazerites in their purification rites (Act 21:21-26).

What could Paul mean when he tells us that he became “as one under the law”, though is not “under the law” (1 Cor 9:10)? Many have interpreted the expression ὑπὸ νόμον (“under the law”) as a reference to living under the authority of the Mosaic Law. As Michael Bird (2016) writes:

That Paul is “not under the law” (μὴ ...ὑπὸ νόμον) is rather striking, since being “under the law” is a signature way of describing a covenantally faithful Jew (see Gal 4:4, 21; cf. Rom 3:19; 7:6; Phil 3:6) and something Paul says that Gentile Christ – believers should not aspire to be (Gal 5:18; Rom 6:14-15) (p. 6).

Thomas Schreiner (2008) argues that when Paul says that he is “not under the law” (1 Cor 9:20-21), this is a reference to the law as it creates a barrier between Jews and Gentiles (i.e. circumcision, food laws and sabbath keeping). Nonetheless, he believes that ‘Paul still abides by the moral norms of the OT Law’ and that freedom from the law does not mean freedom to ‘violate the normal norms of the law’ (p. 654). The issue with this is that Paul never distinguishes the moral Mosaic law from its ceremonial, nor states that he keeps the moral aspect of it. Instead, Bockmuehl (2000), Brian Tucker (2011) and David J. Rudolph (2016) have argued that to become “as one under the law” refers to those holding a stricter interpretation of the law or more specially the Pharisees. David J. Rudolph (2016) supports this reading by appealing to Phil 3:5, where Paul uses νόμον “in reference to Pharisaic interpretation of the law” (pp. 156-157). The issue with this, however, is that while νόμον in Phil 3:5 clearly denotes the Mosaic law, the connection to the Pharisaic Halakah is a function of the term Φαρισαῖος, not νόμον.

Nonetheless, if Paul is not under the νόμον, why does he tell us in v.21 Paul that he is not free from ἄνομος Θεοῦ ("God's Law")? This is clearly, as Brian Tucker (2011) has recognized, a reference to the Law of Moses in second temple texts (Ezra 7:12; Neh 8:8; Sirach 41:8) (p. 108). Moreover, he states that he is under ἔννομος Χριστοῦ ("Christ's Law") (1 Cor 9:21; cf. Gal 6:2). Barclay (2005) has drawn attention to the relationship between the law of Christ mentioned in Galatian 6:2, and the fulfilment of the law by the love command in 5:14, and has convincingly shown that when Paul speaks of the law of Christ the word "law" still refers to the Mosaic Law. Thus, fulfilling the law of Christ is another reference to fulfilling the Mosaic Law.

What then could Paul mean when he states that he is not ὑπὸ νόμον ("under the law")? Todd Wilson (2005) argues that Paul employs the phrase ὑπὸ νόμον in Gal 5:13-6:10 as an abbreviation or rhetorical shorthand for being "under the curse of the law" (Gal 3:10, 13). In Galatians "under the law" is matched by phrases such as "under the pedagogue" (3:25), "under sin" (3:22), "under a curse" (3:10), and "under the elements" (4:3). When Israel lived under the law, sin dominated and they were taken into captivity by both Assyria (722 BC) and Babylonians (586 BC) because of their failure to do what God had commanded. Paul knew that the curses in Deuteronomy 28 had fallen upon Israel for its disobedience, and that the curse of ejection from the land in Leviticus 18, 20 and 26 had come to pass. Nonetheless, Israel was unable to escape the curse of the law because of their 'inability to come out 'under sin' (cf. 3:10-12; 4:21-7)'. Thus, the main point of the metaphor of the pedagogue is that Israel's confinement under the curse of the law, means that the law is 'not a mediator of the promise, but a mere pedagogue, a household slave' that reminds them that they cannot access the inheritance (cf. 4:1-3) (p. 376).

However, in saying that Christ 'became for us a curse' (3:13), Paul wanted them to understand Christ redeemed them from the curse of the law by 'submitting himself to the law's curse (3:10a, 3:13)' (p. 372). Until Christ came to redeem Israel from the curse of the law (3:13; 4:4-5), Israel was kept 'under law' – under the law's curse (p. 378). Therefore, when Paul speaks of not being "under the law", he is not speaking of a freedom from the restraining influence or 'legalistic' system of the law, but of the curse of death (p. 383). Wilson subsequently understands the role of the spirit as enabling them to serve one another through love and thus fulfil the law, thereby avoiding the curse and receiving the eschatological inheritance or blessing. This is the point of 5:18: 'if you are led by the spirit, you are not under law' (p. 389).

Nonetheless, Wilson (2005) is less confident about the use of "under law" as a metaphor for "under the curse of the law" in Romans 6:14-15 and 1 Corinthians 9:20-21:

Paul's use of "under law" as a shorthand for "under the curse of the law" may very well have been an ad hoc device used only in Galatians to address the particular situation in Galatia. There is no reason why this could not have been the case, nor why in Galatians and another way in some other letter. This not intended to sidestep this issue of Paul's other uses of "under law" in Rom 6:14-15 or 1 Cor 9:20-21. I am less confident, however, about how to understand Paul's use of the expression in those content, even though a reference to the curse of the law is not impossible in either one, particularly not in Romans (p. 390).

My view is that the phrase "under the law" is used in a somewhat similar manner in Romans 6:14-15 and 1 Cor 9:20-21. Firstly, although 'curse' language is absent from

Romans, an emphasis on *the* curse is not absent (i.e. the penalty of death). In Romans, sin is a power which brings about death (5:12-14) and enslaves those it has power over (6:20). The intention of the law is to assist or protect the people of Israel from this power of sin, but instead sin had used the law to stir up sinful passions (7:5) and multiply law-breaking (7:8-11). But this did not mean that the law was not to blame, it was sin which had abused the law (7:8-13), and the weakness of the flesh which had submitted to its enticement (7:14-23; 8:3).

Therefore, to be “under the law” in Romans 6:14-15 describes the situation of the Jews, who had sought protection “under the law” from the power of sin, but had found that they (like the Gentiles) were still under its sway and the corresponding curse of death. Instead, the only protection from this power of sin was to be “under grace”; to be justified through faith in Jesus Christ. The contrast is made clear in Romans 8:3:

There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus.
For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set you free from the law of sin and of death.

Paul is not referring to two different laws but to the Mosaic law (good and holy in itself) and its relationship to Christ. Apart from Christ, the mosaic law is characterised by sin and death. In Christ, the same law is characterised by righteousness and life. The difference is that promised (eschatological) spirit inscribed the law on the hearts of God’s people (cf. Jer 31:31-34; Ezek 36:26-27) and empowered them to fulfil the righteousness requirements of the law (Rom 8:4). This is what is meant by the phrase “the law of the Spirit of life” (Rom 8:2) or “the law of Christ” (Gal 6:2; cf. 1 Cor 9:21)

Thus in 1 Cor 9:21 Paul can say that although he is not under the law, he is not ἄνομος ("lawless"), but ἐννομος Χριστοῦ, ("subject to" or "in Christ's law"). Paul is contrasting obedience to the law according to flesh (which leads to death) and obedience to the law according to the spirit (which leads to life). Therefore, when Paul speaks of the "law of Christ" he is referring to the Mosaic law understood in its relationship to Christ and within the realm of spirit.

3.2.3 Summary and Conclusion

David Catchpole set out two theological presuppositions of the Apostolic Decree: (1) the requirements are "fundamentally mosaic" and (2) following from this, the theology underlying the Decree does nothing about the Jew/ Gentile distinction. For David Catchpole, these theological presuppositions were "repugnant to Paul". Firstly, it has been argued that Christians are controlled by corporate participation 'in Christ Jesus' (Gal 3:8), ending the old Jewish/ Gentile distinction. Secondly, it has been argued that there is at the centre of Paul's theology a polemic against the Mosaic law, which meant that it no longer carried any positive or practical meaning.

Firstly, whilst corporate participation "in Christ" functions as a designation of group-identity, this does not mean that previous identities are eradicated. For Jewish and Gentile Christians, their identities and accompanying ethical imperatives remain distinctive: his "rule in all the churches" previous social identities are part of God's call (1 Cor 7:17-20) and sabbath or kosher observance is a legitimate practise done 'in honour of the lord' (Rom 14:6). Moreover, "no distinction" language may be taken in a soteriological sense: there is no distinction between Jewish and Gentile members because they were equally sinners and equally justified through faith in Jesus Christ.

Secondly, when Paul tells us that he is “not under the law” (Gal 5:18; Rom 6:14; 1 Cor 9:20-21), he is not speaking of a freedom from the restraining influence or ‘legalistic’ system of the law, but of the curse of death. The intention of the law is to assist or protect the people of Israel from this power of sin, but instead sin had used the law to stir up sinful passions (Rom 7:5) and multiply law-breaking (Rom 7:8-11). In other words, Israel was unable to escape the curse of the law because of their inability to come out ‘under sin’ (cf. Gal 3:10-12; 4:21-7). According to Paul, however, ‘if you are led by the spirit, you are not under law’ (Gal 5:18) for the ‘law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set you free from the law of sin and of death’ (Rom 8:2). Therefore, apart from Christ, the mosaic law is characterised by sin and death. In Christ, the same law is characterised by righteousness and life. Thus, in 1 Cor 9:21 Paul can say that although he is not under the law, he is not ἄνομος (“lawless”), but ἔννομος Χριστοῦ, (“subject to” or “in Christ’s law”).

3.3 The Third Issue: Paul's attitude towards Apostolic Decree and the prohibitions binding on Gentile believers

Paul clearly repeated the prohibition against sexual immorality and viewed it as a destructive vice which undermines a believer's inheritance in God's Kingdom (1 Cor 5:11; Gal 5:9; Col 3:5; Eph 5:4, 5; cf. Rom 1:26-27). The issue has been his relationship to the other restrictions: 'things polluted by idols, whatever has been strangled and blood' (Acts 15:20, 29). Traditional interpreters of 1 Corinthians 8-10 have typically argued that Paul: (1) allowed Christians to eat food offered to idols, provided that no idol worship was involved; and that (2) abstention of idol-food is conditional only on the concerns of others, that is, when it causes the weak to stumble. As such, Barrett (1965) contends that at the heart of Paul's position in 1 Corinthians 8-10 he permits the eating of idol-food, concluding that "it is difficult to believe that Paul was present when the Decree was drawn up" (p. 149). As David Horrell (2007) writes:

Had Paul meant plainly to prohibit the eating of idol-food he could have done so quite simply... A phrase as is used in Did 6:3 would have been unambiguous: 'keep strictly from that which is offered to idols (p. 6).'

For Richard Bauckham (1995) the real problem is that "Paul seems to ignore the prohibition on eating meat with blood in it" in 1 Cor 10: 25, 27. The prohibition would qualify this advice to such an extent "that it is difficult to suppose he simply takes it for granted (p. 470)"

3.3.1 Paul's position on Idol-Food in 1 Corinthians 8-10

The Corinthians had developed a theological justification for eating food sacrificed to idols, which is summarised: 'there is no idol in the world and there is not God but one'. If an idol was nothing they could rationalise their eating of food sacrificed to

idols and attending of temple feasts. If they didn't bow to, or acknowledge the presence of an idol, their conscience felt free to attend. But not everyone had this gnosis of the non-reality of idols and the consequent acceptability of idol-food. They are unable to eat idol food except as something belonging to an idol, and thus by doing so they pollute or defile their weak conscience (8:7).

Paul does not disagree with the theological principles of the strong, nor with the consequence drawn, but recognises that the exercise of their authority may become a stumbling block to the weak (1 Cor 8:9). Therefore, Paul insists on a 'christologically based pattern of self-giving for one's brothers and sisters in Christ' because right action is not matter of knowledge but love: 'Knowledge puffs up but love builds up' (8:1) (Horrell, 2005, p. 173). N.T Wright (1993) points to the Christological basis here:

Underlying it all is the same principle which Paul articulated in Philippians 2:1-5, and for which he drew up the "lordly example" of Christ in Philippians 2:5-11: one must gladly give up one's rights for the sake of the unity of the body of Christ (p. 135).

In 1 Cor 9, Paul cites his own conduct in his ministry as an example of giving up one's 'rights' for the sake of others. Thus, Paul acknowledged the knower's authentic right to consume food offered to idols, even in some temple meals (see 1 Cor 8:10), but calls for the complete non-use of that right for the sake of the 'weak'.

The focus of Paul's arguments in 1 Cor 10:1-22 appears to shift: he speaks of those who participate in sacrifice (10:10) and 'share in the table of demons'(10:21). As Derek Newton (1998) observes, 'Paul's emphasis is thus very much on those involved in the actual acts of making and eating sacrifices' (p. 338). To warn of the

danger of idolatry, Paul draws on the example of Israel's history (1 Cor 10:1-3; cf. Num 25:1-9). This is a warning for the strong against complacency (v.14): 'if you think you are standing, watch out that you do not fall' (v.12). As David Horrell (1998) writes:

On the one hand, idols are nothing; they are not gods, but ridiculous artefacts made by humans hand (e.g. Isa 44.9-20), yet at the same time (or precisely for this reason?) idolatry – giving worship and allegiance to anything other than YHWH – is a dangerous and heinous sin (e.g. Deut 6.13-15) (p. 97).

For Paul, neither idols nor things sacrificed to them are insignificant, for to sacrifice to them was to sacrifice to demonic powers and not to God: 'you cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of Demons. You cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons' (1 Cor 10:21). Idolatry is depicted here as participation which is incompatible with the believer's participation in Christ, initiated in baptism and affirmed in the Lord's supper (10:16-17). Therefore, all temple meals are prohibited for Paul, but not for the same reason: some temple meals are inherently idolatrous and defiling, and must be avoided at all costs (1 Cor 10:14-22); others are not inherently sinful and defiling, but must be avoided for the sake of the 'weak' (1 Cor 8:10).

According to Gordon Fee (1980), the basic problem Paul wished to address is suggested in 8:10, where dining in an idol's temple is mentioned. He suggests that throughout 1 Cor 8:1 – 11:1 (i.e., in 8:1, 4, 7, 10, and 10:19) εἰδωλόθυτος means sacrificial food eaten at a cultic meal in the temple area (pp. 181-187). Likewise, Ben Witherington (1993) has stated that εἰδωλόθυτος in all its first century AD occurrences means animals sacrificed in the presence of an idol and eaten in the

temple precincts. It does not refer to a sacrifice which has come from the temple and is eaten elsewhere (p. 240). Therefore, Fee (2001) argues that 'going to the temple is wrong twice: it is not acting in love and (later) it is fellowship in the demonic' (p. 122). Paul discloses "later" (in 1 cor 10:1-22) that going to the temples, even in 1 cor 8:10, is objectively wrong. Thus, the only difference is that he argues in ch.8 on ethical grounds, while in 10:1-22 he argues on theological grounds.

Fisk (1989), on the other hand, argues that εἰδωλόθυτος normally carries the general sense 'meat offered to idols'. E. Coye Still (2002) concludes his survey of non-Pauline occurrences of the term stating that it 'may refer to food offered in sacrifice and consumed as part of a temple meal, but means simply food with a sacrificial history' (p. 231). For example, in Rev 2:14, 20 εἰδωλόθυτος may refer to eating food as part of idolatrous worship, if the details of the OT background are considered. They are changed with holding to the teaching of Balaam: in Numbers 25:1-18 and 21:16, Balaam instructed the Moabite women in how to turn away the Israelites from YHWH, which included sexual immorality, attendance of sacrifices, and eating and bowing before the gods. The emphasis is very much on participation in sacrificial practises and the consumption of εἰδωλόθυτος as part of that idolatrous worship.

The same can be said of 1 Corinthians 10:1-22: Paul draws on the example of Israel's practise in Numbers 25 (10:1-3); the call is to "flee from the worship of idols" (10:14); and, as David Gill (1974) maintains, the reference to τραπέζης δαιμονίων ("table of demons") is most applicable to the temple setting (p. 118). On the other hand, the focus in 1 Cor 8:7 is on the consumption of εἰδωλόθυτος. The consciences of the weak are defiled because they ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν ("eat as of sacrificed to an idol"). As Fisk (1989) observes, the point depends on the capacity of some eat as if it were not sacrificed to an idol, that is without defilement (p. 60). Conversely,

participation with demons by taking part in the table of demons (= idol worship) is objectively defiling (1 Cor 10.20-21)

Although Alex Cheung (1999) agrees that εἰδωλόθυτος should be taken in its broader sense, he argues that Paul forbids eating εἰδωλόθυτος in any situation since it is inherently defiling. At first, Paul tries to identify himself with the knowers' stance by an appeal to the possibility of the destruction of the weak. Then, at the second stage in 10.1-22, Paul focuses on the dangers to the knowers themselves: eating idol food will bring them into destruction. Cheung concludes: 'to eat idol food is both unloving and idolatrous. It will cause the weak to ruin and bring God's judgement against idolatry oneself (p. 109).' Thus, Cheung denies that Paul acknowledges (in 1 Cor 8) an authentic right for the knowers to consume food offered to idols. The problem is that Paul articulates the consumption of idol food in terms of renouncing one's freedom/ right in 1 Cor 9. If the consumption of idol food is intrinsically evil, it is neither an option nor a 'right'. Instead, the emphasis in 1 Cor 10:1-22 is on participation in idolatrous cultic meals and not the consumption of εἰδωλόθυτος.

Therefore, in 1 Cor 8 Paul acknowledged the right to consume food offered to idols, even in some temple meals (see 1 Cor 8:10), but called for the complete non-use of that right for the sake of the 'weak'. In 1 Cor 10:25-27, however, Paul deals with some more specific situations: (a) the issue of meat purchased in the meat market and (b) invitations to meals from unbelievers. Regarding the first, they're free to buy and consume anything sold in the market without raising questions of conscience. Magnus Zetterholm (2005) speculates that Paul relied on a proto-rabbinic halakhah that considered sold objects to be "non-sacral" in status:

The reason Paul finds food bought at the market least problematic is presumably also the lack of an immediate cultic context, and it is not inconceivable that here Paul draw from a local Jewish halakhah concerning food bought at the market in Corinth when creating a set of rules for Gentile Jesus-believers. Rabbinic literature shows that the rabbis discussed the extent to which the act of selling disconnects objects from a ceremonial context. In the Tosefta, R. Jehuda ha-Nasi is said to have advocated the view that selling in general signified a nonsacral status for an object (see m. Avodah Zarah 4:4-5; cf. t. Avodah Zarah 5:5; see also Tomson 1990: 217-218) (p. 15).

Therefore, whereas food offered in the temple of an idol (8:10) is known to be sacrificed to idols and hence forbidden (for the sake of the 'weak'), the food bought in the market or served in the home of an unbeliever is of an unspecified nature. The food is no longer intended for idolatrous worship and therefore would not cause harm another person's conscience. Nonetheless, if someone were to announce that it had been offered to an idol, then they should abstain from eating for the sake of the other persons conscience (10:27). To eat the food after being told it has been offered to idols would have implied that they could worship the Lord and consciously participate in idolatry.

Therefore, as Fotopoulos (2003, p. 251) suggests, there are four different situations in which eating sacrificial food takes place:

- (a) 8.1-13 in a pagan temple precinct
- (b) 10.14-22 at the table of a god in formal meals
- (c) 10.27-11.1 at a meal attended by invitation which a pagan is hosting, probably at a private home

(d) 10.25 in the macellum/ market

Paul completely condemns the eating of idol food on the occasions depicted in (a) and (b). The former for the sake of 'weak' (1 Cor 8:10); the latter as it is inherently idolatrous and defiling (1 Cor 10:14-22). Nonetheless, Paul allowed the eating of εἰδωλόθυτος on the occasion depicted in (c) and (d). While Food offered in the temple of an idol (8:10) is known to be sacrificed to an idol, in the occasion depicted in (c) and (d), the food is not intended for idolatrous worship and is of unspecified nature. Thus, it can be eaten as it would not cause harm to another person's conscience. Nevertheless, if someone were to announce that it had been offered to an idol, then, as in 1 Cor 8, they must abstain from eating for the sake of the other persons conscience (10:27).

There is every reason to believe that Paul's position on εἰδωλόθυτος in 1 Corinthians 8-10 is a clarification of the prohibition in the Apostolic Decree and not a rejection of it. In other words, the reason εἰδωλόθυτος is prohibited is for the sake of the 'weak' in conscience. Karin Zetterholm (2015) concludes that Paul's argument makes sense within the framework of Jewish law and bears a remarkable similarity to later rabbinic debates surrounding idolatry, especially in Avodah Zarah. For example, this position towards εἰδωλόθυτος – of abstaining for the sake of the 'weak' – is similar to the rabbinic idea of mar'it 'ain: 'the principle to which one must refrain from acts that are permitted but in appropriate because they may lead a less knowledgeable Jew to draw false conclusions and cause him or her to something that is not permitted' (p. 96). The Rabbis did not perceive the powers of idolatry as being in food, but in the way Pagan treated them. Thus, in theory it does not matter if they eat food sacrificed to Greco-Roman gods, but in practise it is prohibited because of the harmful impact it might have (p. 97).

Nonetheless, C.K. Barrett (1965) stated that “Paul is nowhere more un-Jewish” than in his rule that anything sold in the market can be eaten (10:25) (p. 49). Likewise, Derek Newton (1998) states that his essential ‘Jewishness’ regarding idolatry is ‘set aside in 10.25-26 where he allows any market food – presumably some of which has been sacrificed to idols (1998, p. 375).’ On the other hand, E.P Sanders (2016) has stated that Paul’s approach in 1 Cor 10:27-29 is not especially un-Jewish:

It may well have been a common Jewish attitude when dining with Pagan friends. Barrett thinks that this is Paul’s most un Jewish attitude. My own guess is that it too has a home somewhere in Judaism (p. 281).

Karin Zetterholm (2015) has shown Paul’s reasoning is somewhat to Rabbinic reasoning when doing business with gentiles. Namely, they were forbidden to sell goods to individual if specified that it would be used for an idolatrous, but if unspecified they were permitted to sell to them and did not need to inquire about their purpose (t. Abod. Zar. 1:21). Thus, as in 1 Cor 10:25-29, if not explicitly stated it does not represent idolatry, but if specified it does and is forbidden (pp. 98-99).

3.3.2 Prohibition against “blood” and “things strangled”

The prohibitions against “blood” and “things strangled” are probably two approaches the same issue; in other words, strangled animals would not have had the blood drained. For Richard Bauckham (1995), “Paul seems to ignore the prohibition on eating meat with blood in it”:

This prohibition would qualify his advice in 10:25, 27 to such an extent that it is difficult to suppose he simply takes it for granted. So it seems that if Paul initially accept the decree, he came to regard the prohibition of blood as impracticable (p. 470).

Nevertheless, while Paul expresses the question of Idol Meat (1 Cor 8 & 10) and clean/unclean food (Rom 14:14), he never explicitly addresses the prohibition of blood. As such, it would be impossible to say with certainty whether Paul agreed or disagreed with it. But, as Markus Bockmuehl (2000) writes, 'given the consistent practise of Judaism and of the ancient church in both East and West, the burden of proof seems to lie pretty squarely with those who would argue that Paul blithely tolerated Christian consumption of blood. (p. 169)' For one, the full force of the Torah is behind it: Noah may eat any living thing but consumption of blood is prohibited in Gen 9:3-4; the person eating blood will be 'cut off' from the people (Lev 17:10); and although the alien sojourning in Israel may eat unclean animals (Deut 14:21), blood consumption is prohibited (Lev 17:10-14). Moreover, it is reaffirmed at the Apostolic Council in Acts 15:20, 29 as a prohibition for Gentile members of the Eschatological people of God.

Therefore, it's possible that Paul never mentioned the prohibition simply because it was a less pressing concern compared to sexual misconduct or idol meat. In fact, E.P. Sanders (2016) has pointed out that pagan slaughter routinely drained meat of its blood:

On the whole, pagan sacrificial technique was like Jewish: the animal bled to death. In some cases the victim's head was drawn back, and the carotid artery was opened with a stab. In other cases the throat was slit. Most of the blood was drained and thrown on the alter (p. 387).

Since Pagans did not hang up the carcass, as Jews did, the blood would have remained in the carcass initially, but it would have been eliminated before it got to the marketplace:

After the animal was slaughtered and before it was butchered, there was still some blood in the carcass. This, however, was soon eliminated. The animal was eviscerated, the joints were separated, and then the meat was boned. This removed any remaining blood, even though evisceration and dismemberment began with the carcass lying on its back, rather than hung up in the Jewish manner (p. 388).

Therefore, the actual consumption of meat with blood was untypical even among pagans, and would have been easily avoidable for Jews. Thus, there is no reason to believe that Paul rejected the prohibition, but every reason to believe that he had no need to mention it.

3.3.3 Summary and Conclusion

Interpreters of 1 Corinthians 8-10 have typically argued that Paul: (1) allowed Christians to eat food offered to idols, provided that no idol worship was involved; and that (2) abstention of idol-food is conditional only on the concerns of others, that is, when it causes the weak to stumble. For the most part, the traditional interpretation of 1 Corinthians 8-10 is correct. In 1 Cor 8, Paul acknowledged the knower's authentic right to consume food offered to idols, even in some temple meals (see 1 Cor 8:10), but calls for the non-use of that right for the sake of the 'weak'. Contra Alex Cheung and Peter D. Gouch, the consumption of idol food is not inherently defiling. Only insofar if the consumption of idol-food involved the worship of idols it is inherently defiling (10.1-22). Moreover, whereas food offered in the temple of an idol (8:10) is known to be sacrificed to idols and hence forbidden (for the sake of the 'weak'), food bought in the market or served in the home of an unbeliever (10:25-27) is of an unspecified nature and can be consumed.

Nonetheless, C.K. Barrett states that “Paul is nowhere more un-Jewish” than in this position on idol-food and that “it is difficult to believe that Paul was present when the Decree was drawn up”. In my opinion, it is possible to read Paul’s position as a clarification of the prohibition in the Apostolic Decree and not a rejection of it. Karin Zetterholm has concluded that Paul’s arguments made sense within the framework Jewish law and bears a remarkable similarity to later rabbinic debates surrounding idolatry, especially in Avodah Zarah. The Rabbis did not perceive the powers of idolatry as being in food, but in the way Pagan treated them. Thus, in theory it does not matter if they eat food sacrificed to Greco-Roman gods, but in practise it is prohibited because of the harmful impact it might have on others.

The prohibitions against “blood” and “things strangled” are probably two approaches the same issue; in other words, strangled animals would not have had the blood drained. Nonetheless, while Paul addressed the question of Idol food (1 Cor 8 & 10) and clean/unclean food (Rom 14:14), he never explicitly addresses the consumption of blood. As such, it would be impossible to say with certainty whether Paul agreed or disagreed with it. Nonetheless, given the consistent practise of Judaism and the early church, the burden of proof is with those who would argue that Paul tolerated it. It’s entirely possible that Paul never mentioned the prohibition because it was a less pressing concern. In other words, the actual consumption of meat with blood was untypical even among pagans and would have been easily avoidable.

Chapter 4: Conclusion

F.C. Baur proposed that early Christianity was marked by a schism and divide between Jewish (Petrine) Christianity and Gentile (Pauline) Christianity. Many scholars have upheld the main thrust of this thesis, including Dibelius (1956: 96-107); Nicole (1966:58); Catchpole (1977: 434-37); Hengal (1979: 11-17); Schneider (1980: 113; 1982: 1991); and Dunn (1983: 38). On this view, Paul could never have consented to – or even been present at – the apostolic council and agreed to this decree which established a minimum set of requirements for Gentile believers. My thesis, contra F.C. Baur, is that this divide between Jewish (Petrine) and Gentile (Pauline) Christianity has been overstated and derives from a misunderstanding of the Apostle Paul.

Firstly, the Apostolic Council in Acts 15 agreed that Gentiles can join the eschatological people of God as Gentiles, *but* established that they must keep a minimum set of requirements as proscribed by Torah: 'to abstain only from things polluted by idols and from fornication and from whatever has been strangled and from blood' (15:20, 29). These four prohibitions correspond to the four things that are prohibited to the "the alien who sojourns in your/their midst" in Leviticus 17-18 and can be understood to refer to the moral impurities of the Canaanites that it exhorts the Israelites not to follow in Leviticus 18:24-30, as it would defile themselves and the land.

There are, in my opinion, three core issues which arise when it comes to the relationship between the Apostolic Decree (Acts 15:20, 29) and the Apostle Paul. In response, I have made the following points:

[1] Galatians was written to the churches of South Galatia immediately prior to the Apostolic Council in Acts 15 (around A.D. 48) and the crisis in Antioch (Gal 2:11-14) was the occasion for it (Gal 2:11-14 = Acts 15:1-2), i.e. the agreement made at Apostolic Council in Acts 15 restored a shared table fellowship which had broken down after the Antioch incident in Galatians 2:11-14. On this view, Galatians 2:1-10 is equated with the famine visit of Acts 11:29-30. Thus, at this private meeting with 'the pillars' (in Gal 2:1-10) the issue of Circumcision was discussed, but at the public meeting in Acts 15 an authoritative ruling was established resolved the circumcision issue and the issue of shared table fellowship.

[2] Paul's corporate Christology functions as a designation of group-identity, but this does not mean that previous identities are eradicated. Instead, for Paul (as with the Apostolic Decree) Jewish and Gentile Christians identities and accompanying ethical imperatives remain distinctive (cf. 1 Cor 7:17-20; Romans 14...). Consequently, Paul's "no distinction" language () may be taken in a soteriological sense: Jewish and Gentile believers were equally sinners and equally justified through faith in Jesus Christ. As such, the Mosaic Law still carried positive and practical meaning. Thus, when Paul tells us that he is "not under the law" (Gal 5:18; Rom 6:14; 1 Cor 9:20-21), he is not speaking of a freedom from the restraining influence or 'legalistic' system of the law, but obedience according the flesh which leads to the curse of death.

[3] For the most part, the traditional interpretation of 1 Corinthians 8-10 is correct. Contra Alex Cheung and Peter D. Gough, the consumption of idol food is not inherently defiling. Instead, Paul acknowledged the knower's authentic right to consume food offered to idols, but calls for the non-use of that right for the sake of the 'weak'. Nonetheless, this position may be read as an explanation of the prohibition in the Apostolic Decree. Following Karin Zetterholm, it made sense within

the framework of Jewish law and later rabbinic debates, especially in Avodah Zarah. Furthermore, since Paul never mentioned the prohibition against “blood” and “things strangled”, it is impossible to say with certainty whether he agreed with it or not. Nonetheless, given the consistent practise of Judaism and the early church, the burden of proof is with those who would argue against it. It's entirely possible that Paul never mentioned the prohibition simply because the actual consumption of meat with blood was untypical among pagans.

Word Count: 19482

Bibliography

- A. Wilson, T. (2005). 'Under Law' in Galatians: A Pauline Theological Abbreviation. *Journal of Theological Studies*, NS, Vol.56, Pt 2, 362-392.
- Barclay, J. (1996). Do we undermine the Law?": A study of Romans 14.1–15.6. In J. Barclay, *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews* (pp. 37-59). Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Barclay, J. M. (2005). *Obedying the Truth: Paul's Ethics in Galatian*. Regent College Publishing.
- Barclay, J. M. (2013). Faith and Self-Detachment from Cultural Norms: A Study in Romans 14–15. *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 104.2, 192-208.
- Barret, C. K. (1968). *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Black.
- Barrett, C. (1965). Things sacrificed to Idols. *NTS* 11, 138-153.
- Bauckham, R. (1995). James and the Jerusalem Church. In R. Bauckham, *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting, Vol. 4: The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting* (pp. 415-80). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Bauckham, R. (1996). James and the Gentiles (Acts. 13-21). In B. Witherington, *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (pp. 154-184). Cambridge University Press.
- Bauckham, R. (2005). James, Peter, and the Gentiles. In B. Chilton, & C. Evans., *The missions of James, Peter, and Paul: tensions in early Christianity* (pp. 90-142). Brill.
- Bauckham, R. (2010). The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why. In R. Bauckham, *The Jewish World around the New Testament* (pp. 175-192). Baker Publishing Group.
- Baur, F. C. (1876). *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Work, His Epistles and His Doctrine. A Contribution to the Critical History of Primitive Christianity. Vol. 1*. Williams and Norgate.
- Bennema, C. (n.d.). The ethnic conflict in early Christianity: an appraisal of Bauckham's proposal on the Antioch crisis and the Jerusalem council. *JETS* 56/4, 2013.
- Bird, M. (2016). *An Anomalous Jew: Paul amongst Jews, Greek and Romans*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Boccaccini, G. (2016). *Paul the Jew: Rereading the Apostle as a Figure of Second Temple Judaism*. Fortress Press.
- Bock, D. L. (2007). *Acts*. Baker Academic.
- Bockmuehl, M. (2000). *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches: Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics*. A&C Black.
- Bornkamm, G. (1971). *Paul*. Harper & Row.
- Boyarín, D. (1994). *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. University of California Press.
- Bruce, F. F. (1968). Paul and Jerusalem. *Tyndale Bulletin* 19, 3-25.
- Bruce, F. F. (1969). Galatian Problems 1: Autobiographical Data. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 51 (2), 292-309.

- Bruce, F. F. (1969). Galatian Problems 2: North or South Galatians? *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 52 (2), 243-266.
- Bruce, F. F. (1971). galatian Problems 4: The Date Of The Epistle. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 54 (2), 250-267.
- Bruce, F. F. (1986). The Apostolic Decree of Acts 15. *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments: Festschrift zum, 80*.
- Bruce, F. F. (1988). *The Book of the Acts*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing House.
- Bruce, F. F. (1990). *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids.
- Bruce, F. F. (2013). *The Epistle to the Galatians*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Buckham, D. (2012). North South Galatia Theory. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/2099646/NORTH_SOUTH_GALATIAN_THEORY?auto=download
- Burton, E. D. (1920). *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, Volume 36*. C. Scribner's sons.
- C.Brun, J. (1985). Rejected, Ignored, or Misunderstood? The Fate of Paul's Approach to the Problem of Food Offered to Idols in Early Christianity. *New Test. Stud, Vol. 31*, 113-124.
- Campbell, W. S. (2008). *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity*. A&C Black.
- Carson, D. A. (1986). Pauline Inconsistency: Reflections on 1 Corinthians 9.19–23 and Galatians 2.11–14. *Churchman* 100, 6-45.
- Cheung, A. T. (1999). *Idol Food in Corinth: Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy*. Sheffield Academic Press Ltd.
- Crossley, J. G. (2004). *The Date of Mark's Gospel: Insight from the Law in Earliest Christianity*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- D.Gooch, P. (1993). *Dangerous Food: 1 Corinthians 8-10 in Its Context*. Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- D.Nanos, M. (1996). *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter*. Augsburg Fortress.
- Dibelius, M. (1956). *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. SCM Press.
- Donaldson, T. L. (1997). *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the apostle's convictional world*. Fortress Press.
- Donaldson, T. L. (2007). *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)*. Baylor University Press.
- Dunn, J. D. (1983). The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2: 11-18). *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 5.18, 3-57.
- Dunn, J. D. (1990). *Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*. John Knox Press.
- Dunn, J. D. (2003). *Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

- Dunn, J. D. (2006). *The partings of the ways: between Christianity and Judaism and their significance for the character of Christianity*. SCM.
- Dunn, J. D. (2009). *Beginning from Jerusalem: Christianity in the Making*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Ehrensperger, K. (2010). Called to be Saints': The Identity-Shaping Dimension of Paul's Priestly Discourse in Romans. In K. Ehrensperger, & B. Tucker, *Reading Paul in Context: Explorations in Identity Formation. Essays in Honour of William S. Campbell* (pp. 90-109). A&C Black,.
- Ehrensperger, K. (2013). *Paul at the Crossroads of Cultures: Theologizing in the Space Between*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Esler, P. F. (1989). *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Esler, P. F. (2013). *Galatians*. Routledge.
- Fee, G. D. (1980). Εἰδωλόθυτα Once Again: An Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 8-10. *Biblica* 61.2, 172-197.
- Fee, G. D. (1987). *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Fee, G. D. (2001). *To what End Exegesis? Essays Textual, Exegetical, and Theological*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Feldman, L. H. (1996). *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton University Press.
- Fisk, B. N. (1989). Eating meat offered to idols: Corinthian behavior and Pauline response in 1 Corinthians 8-10 (A response to Gordon Fee). *Trinity Journal* 10.1, 49-70.
- Fotopoulos, J. (2003). *Food offered to idols in Roman Corinth: A social-rhetorical reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8: 1-11: 1*. Mohr siebeck.
- Fung, R. Y. (1988). *The Epistle to the Galatians*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Garland, D. E. (2003). *1 Corinthians*. Baker Academic.
- Gasque, W. W. (2000). *A History of the Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles*. Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Gaston, L. (2006). *Paul and the Torah*. Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Gibson, J. J. (2013). *Peter Between Jerusalem and Antioch: Peter, James, and the Gentiles*. Mohr Siebeck.
- Gill, D. (1974). Trapezomata: A Neglected Aspect of Greek Sacrifice . *HTR* 67.
- Gundry-Volf, J. M. (2003). Beyond Difference? Paul's Vision of a New Humanity in Galatians 3.28. In D. A. Campbell, & A. Torrance, *Gospel and Gender: A Trinitarian Engagment with Being Male and Female in Christ* (pp. 8-37). A&C Black.
- Guthrie, D. (1970). *New testament introduction*. London: Tyndale .
- Hagner, D. A. (2012). *The New Testament: A historical and theological introduction*. Baker Books.

- Hayes, C. E. (2002). *Gentile impurities and Jewish identities: intermarriage and conversion from the Bible to the Talmud*. Oxford University Press.
- Hengel, M. (1980). *Acts and the history of earliest Christianity*. Fortress Press.
- Hodge, C. J. (2007). *If sons, then heirs: a study of kinship and ethnicity in the letters of Paul*. Oxford University Press.
- Hodge, C. J. (2015). The Questions of Identity: Gentiles as Gentiles - but also Not - in Pauline communities. In M. Nanos, & M. Zetterholm, *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle* (pp. 153-175). Fortress Press.
- Horrell, D. (1998). Theological principle or Christological praxis? Pauline ethics in 1 Corinthians 8.1-11.1. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 20.67, 83-114.
- Horrell, D. (2000). No longer Jew or Greek': Paul's corporate Christology and the construction of Christian community. In D. Horrell, *Christology, Controversy and Community* (pp. 321-344). Leiden: Brill.
- Horrell, D. (2002). Solidarity and Difference: Pauline Morality in Romans 14:1-15:13. *Studies in Christian Ethics* 15 (2), 60-78.
- Horrell, D. (2005). *Solidarity and Difference: A Contemporary Reading Paul's Ethics*. Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Horrell, D. (2007). Idol-Food, Idolatry and Ethics in Paul. In S.C.Barton, *Idolatry: false worship in the Bible, Early Judaism, and Christianity* (pp. 120-40). T&T Clark.
- III, B. W. (1993). Not so idle thoughts about eidolothuton. *Tyndale Bulletin* 44.2, 237-254.
- III, B. W. (2003). *New Testament History: A Narrative Account*. Baker Books.
- III, E. C. (2002). The Meaning and Use of Eidolothuton in First Century Non-Pauline Literature and 1 Cor 8:1-11:1: Toward Resolution of the Debate. *Trinity Journal* 23/2, 225-234.
- J.Rudolph, D. (2016). *A Jew to the Jews: Jewish Contours of Pauline Flexibility in 1 Corinthians 9:19-23*. Pickwick Publications.
- Jervell, J. (1971). The Law in Luke-Acts. *Harvard Theological Review* 64.1, 21-36.
- Jervell, J. (1996). *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kaiser, W. C. (1991). *Toward an Old Testament Theology*. Zondervan.
- Keener, C. S. (2014). *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary : Volume 3: 15:1-23:35*. Baker Academic.
- Klawans, J. (2004). *Impurity and sin in ancient Judaism*. Oxford University Press.
- Klawans, J. (2005). *Purity, sacrifice, and the temple: Symbolism and supersessionism in the study of ancient Judaism*. Oxford University Press.
- Lightfoot, J. B. (1910). *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians Vol. 3*. Macmillan and Company, limited.
- Longenecker, R. N. (1990). *Galatians*. NELSON/WORD Publishing Group.
- Martin, R. (1999). *New Testament Foundations, Vol. 2*. Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Matera, F. J. (1992). *Galatians*. Liturgical Press.

- Mitchel, S. (1992). Galatia. In D. N. Freedman, *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. New York: Doubleday.
- Mitchell, S. (1993). *Anatolia: The rise of the Church*. Clarendon Press.
- Moo, D. J. (2013). *Galatians*. Baker Academic.
- Nanos, M. D. (2002). *The irony of Galatians: Paul's letter in first-century context*. Fortress Press.
- Newton, D. (1998). *Deity and Diet: The Dilemma of sacrificial food at Corinth*. Burns & Oates.
- Pamela Michelle Eisenbaum. (2009). *Paul was not a Christian: The original message of a misunderstood apostle*. New York: HarperOne.
- Piotrowski, N. G. (2016). *Matthew's New David at the End of Exile: A Socio-Rhetorical Study of Scriptural Quotations*. BRILL.
- Polhill, J. B. (1972). Galatia Revisted, the Life-Setting of the Epistle. *Review & Expositor* 69.4 , 437-448.
- Porter, S. E. (2016). *The Apostle Paul*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- R.Catchpole, D. (1977). Paul, James and the Apostolic Decree. *NTS* 23.4, 428-444.
- Ramsay, W. M. (1997). *Historical Commentary on Galatians*. Kregel Publications.
- Rudolph, D. (2011). Paul's" Rule in All the Churches"(1 Cor 7: 17-24) and Torah-Defined Ecclesiological Variegation. *Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations* 5.1.
- S.G.Wilson. (2005). *Luke and the Law*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sanders, E. (1977). *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A comparison of patterns of religion*. Fortress Press.
- Sanders, E. (1983). *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish people*. Fortress Press.
- Sanders, E. (2016). *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies*. Fortress Press.
- Sanders, E. P. (1990). Jewish Association with Gentiles and Galatians 2: 11-14. In B. S. Crawford, *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John in Honor of J. Louis Martyn* (pp. 170-88). Abingdon Press.
- Sanders, E. P. (2016). *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE-66 CE*. Fortress Press.
- Schreiner, T. R. (1993). *The law and its fulfillment: a Pauline theology of law*. Baker Books.
- Schreiner, T. R. (2008). *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ*. Baker Academi.
- Schreiner, T. R. (2011). *Galatians*. Zondervan.
- Segal, A. F. (1990). *Paul the convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. Yale University Press.
- Shen, M. L.-T. (2010). *Canaan to Corinth: Paul's doctrine of God and the issue of food offered to idols in 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1*. Peter Lang.
- Tanner, J. P. (2012). James' Quotation of Amos 9 to Settle the Jerusalem Council Debate in Acts 15 . *JETS* 55/1, 65-85.

- Thiselton, A. C. (2000). *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A commentary on the Greek text*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Tomson, P. J. (1990). *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles*. Van Gorcum Fortress Press.
- Tucker, B. (2011). *Remain in Your Calling": Paul and the Continuation of Social Identities in 1 Corinthians*. Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Tyson, J. B. (1999). *Luke, Judaism, and the Scholars: Critical Approaches to Luke-Acts*. Univ of South Carolina Press.
- Waitz, H. (1936). Das problem des sogenannten aposteldekrets. *ZKG* 55, 227-63.
- Ware, J. P. (2005). *The Mission of the Church: In Paul's Letter to the Philippians in the Context of Ancient Judaism*. BRILL.
- Wedderburn, A. J. (1993). The Apostolic Decree: Traditions and Redaction. *Novum Testamentum Vol. 35, Fasc. 4*, 362-389.
- Wilson, S. G. (2005). *Luke and the Law*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, T. A. (2005). 'Under Law' in Galatians: A Pauline Theological Abbreviation. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 56.2, 362-392.
- Wilson, T. A. (2006). The Law of Christ and the Law of Moses: Reflections on a Recent Trend in Interpretation . *Currents in Biblical Research, Volume: 5, issue: 1* , 123-144.
- Wilson, T. A. (2007). *The Curse of the Law and the Crisis in Galatia: Reassessing the Purpose of Galatians*. Mohr Siebeck.
- Witherington, B. (1998). *The Acts of the Apostles*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Wright, N. (1993). *Climax of the covenant: Christ and the law in Pauline theology*. A&C Black.
- Wright, N. (2013). *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. Fortress Press.
- Wright, N. (2015). *Paul and his recent interpreters* . SPCK.
- Wright, N. T. (1992). *The New Testament and the People of God*. SPCK.
- Zetterholm, K. H. (2015). The Question of Assumptions: Torah Observance in the First Century. In M. Nanos, & M. Zetterholm, *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Cetnury Context to the Apostle* (pp. 79-103). Fortress Press.
- Zetterholm, M. (2003). *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation between Judaism and Christianity*. Routledge.
- Zetterholm, M. (2005). Purity and Anger: Gentiles and Idolatry in Antioch. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research of Religion Volume 1, Article 10*, 1-24.